

Hitler's Socialism | Destroying the Denialist Counter-Arguments

<https://youtu.be/eCkyWBPaTC8>

Published 24/02/2020

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Preface to the PDF version | 3 |
| Introduction | 5 |
| Section 1: The Premise of my Argument | 7 |
| Section 2: Definitions | 9 |
| Part 1: Socialism and Capitalism | 9 |
| Part 2: The Definition Debate | 10 |
| Section 3: The Value Debate | 15 |
| Part 1: Value in Society | 15 |
| Part 2: Labour vs Subjective Theories of Value | 16 |
| Section 4: The Crisis of Capitalism? | 19 |
| Part 1: The “Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall” (Fallacy) | 19 |
| Part 2: Capitalism is Failing? | 20 |
| Part 3: The “Shrinking Markets” Debate | 23 |
| Part 4: ‘Fascist Imperialism’ Debunked | 29 |
| Section 5: National Socialist Economic Ideology | 31 |
| Part 1: National Socialism’s Fundamental Ideological Flaw | 31 |
| Part 2: The ‘Jewish World Conspiracy’ | 35 |
| Part 3: Hitler Fights ‘Jewish Capital’ | 39 |
| Part 4: Racial-Socialism | 40 |
| Part 5: Totalitarianism | 42 |
| Section 6: The Nazi Economy | 45 |
| Part 1: ‘Privatization’ | 45 |
| Part 2: ‘Crushing’ the Trade Unions | 56 |
| Part 3: Down with Profit | 56 |
| Part 4: Nazi Commissars | 61 |
| Part 5: Collective Agriculture | 65 |
| Part 6: IG Farben vs the Market Economy | 68 |
| Part 7: The Imploding Social Justice Community | 73 |
| Part 8: The Plunder of Europe | 76 |
| Section 7: The Holocaust & Denialism | 80 |
| Section 8: Other Counterarguments | 83 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| TIK's "Hitler's Socialism" | 2 |
| Part 1: "But the 'Market' Still Existed!" | 83 |
| Part 2: The "Hitler Killed Ernst Röhm" Fallacy | 84 |
| Part 3: Whataboutism | 86 |
| Part 4: "Historians Don't Agree with TIK" | 87 |
| Part 5: TIK vs Academia | 90 |
| Part 6: "TIK is Mentally ill" | 95 |
| Section 9: Conclusion & Summary | 98 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY / SOURCES | 100 |

Preface to the PDF version

The constant barrage of hate I receive on a daily basis from fanatical ideologues has spurred me to publish this video as soon as possible - perhaps a little earlier than I would have liked. Since the issue of Hitler's Socialism is an important debate, I do feel guilty for not spending longer on this to make sure it was more crammed full of facts and sources to fill in the gaps and the details, and I would have liked to have coloured the text like I did in the video, and I should have spent time proof-reading the script! But that's not how the YouTube-world works unfortunately, so it is what it is. No doubt I will be returning to this topic in the future in order to fill in the gaps and add more evidence to the mountain.

In fact, I hadn't intended to publish this as a PDF, but have decided last-minute to do so. And I had intended to create a "What Causes Recessions" video first so I could link to that here and show why the 'crisis of Socialism' is actually the cause of the 'crisis of Capitalism'. (The State is the cause, not the solution to, the problems we face in society and economy.) I do actually refer to the Recession's video in this video/PDF, even though it hasn't been published yet... It will be published soon though.

I would also like to make one thing blatantly clear - I am NOT a Fascist, I am NOT a National Socialist, and I am NOT a Marxist Socialist. And I am NOT promoting said ideologies - in fact, quite the opposite. These ideologies are collectively responsible for the deaths of tens (if not hundreds) of millions of people. Anyone reading/viewing this video/PDF will quickly realize that the presentation of the facts, and the discussion and interpretation of the facts, do more harm to the ideologies in question than good. Sections 2, 3, and 4, expose the problems in the Socialist view of the world. Section 5 Part 1 shows National Socialism's fundamental ideological flaw. And Section 7 explains why denying the Holocaust is not possible. Clearly, such views would not be promoted if I was someone who believed in such ideologies.

And yes, I do get people calling me 'nazi', 'marxist', 'fascist', 'anti-Semitic' and 'pro-Jewish', as well as a host of other things (the Nazis call me a 'Jewish shill', while the Marxists call me a 'neo-nazi'). The contradictory nature of the insults indicates that my Marxist and Nazi opponents are desperately trying to smear and slander me, and paint me as something I am not. These children can't even fathom the concept of individuality, and proceed to 'divine' what they 'believe' are the 'secret thoughts' that I 'really want to say but won't say' (since, apparently, I'm 'really' an 'operative' for 'my' race/gender/class etc.) This allows them to concoct any conspiracy about me that they like. Now, unless these people are Gods, they don't have the power of divination. They also don't grasp the fact that I reject the idea of these artificial social groups that they 'believe' we all 'belong' to. And they don't realise that I cannot be an 'operative' of a fictional group that doesn't exist in the first place. Still, I'm sure the backlash will continue, as will the calls for me to 'stick to tanks', and those claiming 'I know nothing about economics or politics'... Such people should look in the mirror.

Like Newton, the only reason I can see so far is because I am standing on the shoulders of giants. And in this piece I have relied quite heavily upon two 'giants' in particular - Rainer Zitelmann's "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction" and Götz Aly's "Hitler's Beneficiaries." If you would like to read more on this subject, those are the two books you need to get. Zitelmann masterfully dives into Hitler's ideology, and Aly paints a brilliant picture of Europe under Nazi rule. Unfortunately, Zitelmann's book is very difficult to get in English, so German readers may prefer the German version "Hitler: Selbstverständnis eines Revolutionärs". Aly's book is a mass-print so it shouldn't be too difficult to get.

Many of the other historians who continue to make the case for 'Hitler's Capitalism' are not 'bad', and shouldn't be ignored. So long as you grasp the actual definitions of the words 'socialism' and 'capitalism', and can question what they're saying, go right ahead and read them. These historians tend to give tons of evidence of Hitler's Socialism, but then proceed to conclude that it is Capitalism... because socialism+socialism=capitalism, obviously! So it's not their evidence, but their interpretation which is suspect.

But I think this old denialist-view that "Hitler was a Capitalist who only put Socialism in the name of his party to trick the workers" can no longer be held up as gospel. How the myth of 'Hitler's Capitalism' has persisted for so long is beyond me, as I discovered that Hitler was a Socialist within about two hours of reading Mein Kampf after deciding to do videos on the origins of the Holocaust. Have most historians on the Third Reich not read Mein Kampf, or anything else Hitler wrote or said?

All I know is that, since Socialists consistently and collectively fail to define Socialism, we shouldn't take them at their word when they say 'Hitler was not a Socialist'. How can Socialists know what Socialism isn't if they cannot define what Socialism is?

Introduction

As a worker myself, I used to believe in 'socialism'. And I used to believe - like many still do - that Hitler was a capitalist who only put 'socialism' in the name of his party to trick the workers. Upon doing significant research into the origins of the Holocaust, I then realized my mistake - and saw that National Socialism was a variant of Socialism that was hostile to both Marxist-Socialism and Capitalism. I also realized that the assumption I held when I was younger was wrong. The assumption was that Capitalism was inherently evil and was in crisis. This was reinforced during my college and university years, when I was taught a blatantly Marxist, progressive and Keynesian historical narrative of modern history. I did not fully understand the concept of Capitalism, as no one had really explained it to me. And so I thought I was a moderate socialist.

Well, it turns out that the assumption that capitalism is inherently bad, is wrong. It turns out that Socialism is *not* for the workers at all, and has *nothing* to do with the 'poor' or downtrodden either. And it turns out that Hitler's Socialism wasn't Capitalism after all.

"I have not set myself on the road of politics in order to pave the way for an international socialism... I bring the German people a national socialism, the political theory of the national community, the feeling of unity of all who belong to the German nation and who are prepared and willing to feel themselves as being an inseparable but also co-responsible particle of the totality of the nation."¹

I would be more than happy to go back to believing that Hitler was a capitalist. I really would. Considering the backlash I have received so far, with people calling for me to "neck myself" (kill myself) and calling me "pathetic" for holding this supposedly "dishonest" "opinion", it would be far easier for me to give into the social pressure and just pretend Hitler was a Capitalist. It would be far easier if someone actually managed to make a convincing case, which stands up to scrutiny, that Hitler was *really* a Capitalist, so that I could go back to believing it and sweep all this under the rug.

Unfortunately, nobody has done that so far.

And worse, I don't care for *social* pressure. I'm not here for the *social* points. What matters to me is the historical truth. So I'm only going to be persuaded by strong arguments, not by *poor* ones. And the *terrible* arguments presented so far by various Marxist-Socialists, consisting of a poor contradictory interpretation of limited sources, bundled into a distorted perception of the events, coupled with insults and an overall mockery of the concept of 'free speech' leaves me unconvinced. It is not because I'm "mentally ill", as some have claimed. It's because the 'National Socialism is National Socialism' argument is superior to the 'National Socialism is Capitalism' argument.

¹ Hitler to Wagener, from Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P100.

But many aren't convinced, mainly because I've not even had a chance to fully explain myself yet. I haven't had time to present all the evidence, and when I do present evidence, most of my critics don't actually watch the videos anyway. They watch two minutes, decide that I haven't provided enough evidence - in two minutes - and proceed to mock me. This is why any video on this topic immediately comes under attack by mobs of Social-Justice-Fascists who do not care for discussion, nor the truth, only *belief* in 'infallible' socialism. Slander attacks have been brought against me from various different areas of the internet. Worse, people have said that, because I didn't reply to these accusers, I was therefore "refuted".

No. That's not how this works. Just because I don't respond for a while does not mean I've been "refuted". If I *had* been "refuted" then I would happily make a video admitting I'm wrong, which I have done before for other topics, and have no problem doing so again. But that hasn't happened here. Currently, I maintain the position that the National Socialism of the Hitler era was *real* National Socialism, which was Socialist in creed, and was *not* a variety of capitalism.

In this video, I will counter the various points that numerous Marxist Socialists (and others) have made against this argument, in the hope that some of these people will actually listen to me, and actually *try* to understand what I'm saying. Even if you do not agree with what I'm about to say, that's no reason to call me names, slander me, jump to false conclusions or send me death threats. The point of history is to have a debate. At the very least, by taking this position, I am providing you and others the opportunity to debate with me. If I'm wrong, you should have no trouble addressing all the points I'm about to make. *If* I'm wrong...

And, since there was some confusion over *some* of the phrases I was using in previous videos, I'm going to try my best to keep the language as *simple* as possible this time around, and explain things more clearly. If you don't understand what I'm saying, do not assume I'm wrong, get confused and mock me for being wrong, even though I'm not. Ask me to clarify my points instead, or seek answers from those who do understand what I'm saying in the comments below.

Either way, whether you end up agreeing, disagreeing or hating me, I just hope you will find this video useful - since I will be presenting a lot of historical facts and evidence during the process which may come as a surprise to many of you. Thank you.

Section 1: The Premise of my Argument

In a nutshell, my argument is that National Socialism was *real* National Socialism, and that it was a Left-wing Socialist ideology which attempted to implement Socialism during its brief 12 years in power. Hitler hated both (what he called) 'Jewish capitalism' and 'Jewish Bolshevism' (or Marxism).² He saw them both as part of a Jewish plot to take over the world. His anti-Semitism is his anti-Capitalism, and his anti-Semitism is his anti-Marxism, and his pro-German-Racism is his Socialism. He thought that the Jews were causing (what many perceive to be) the 'crisis of capitalism' in order to cause class conflict, which would then be exploited by the Jews, who would usher in a Marxist Revolution. At that point, they would dominate the world and (in Hitler's mind) be the downfall of civilization.³

And it's vital that you understand what I'm *not* saying. I'm *not* saying that *I* believe in what Hitler is saying from a personal political, economic or social perspective. Far from it. I am *not* a National Socialist, *nor* a Fascist, *nor* a Marxist etc. By explaining Hitler's reasoning, or Stalin's reasoning, or Mussolini's reasoning etc, that does not mean I'm embracing those ideologies. (Me explaining the history of war does not mean I'm pro-war.) My goal here is to explain why the Holocaust happened, and expose the ideology that brought it about, and educate people about the nature of that ideology, so that we do not have a repeat of the massacres which totalitarian ideologies have inflicted upon innocent people caught in the grips of their claws.

I'm also *not* saying that National Socialism was Marxism. Marxism is but *one* version of Socialism, and there are many versions of Socialism. Marxism is *not the core concept of Socialism*. In fact, the idea of Socialism *predates* Marxism. As I will show later, Socialism is state-control of the economy. Marxism is a *class* version of this state control of the economy. Marx said that the Utopian Socialists that came before him were unscientific and therefore not *real* Socialists, like he was. And so he created a class-theory of history, and an ideology based on class-socialism.⁴ Then Hitler came along and said Marx was not a real socialist either, calling him unscientific, and embraced a racial-theory of history, and an ideology based on race-socialism.⁵ So I'm saying National Socialism was Socialism. I'm *not* saying it is Marxism. It was also *not* a version of capitalism, because Hitler hated capitalism, which he saw as a Jewish concept. His anti-semitism was his anti-capitalism. And his anti-Marxism was because he thought Marxism was also a Jewish concept. So he didn't like Marxism or Capitalism, and embraced a variant of Socialism which was, supposedly, somewhere between the two. This was known as the National Socialist 'Third Way'.⁶

² Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P198, P268-269, P324, P324 P555, P556.

³ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P306-307, P556. Hitler, "Second Book," P26-28. Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P15-16, P135-137, P212-215, P231-239, P264-266, P274-282, P422-427.

⁴ Birchall, "The Spectre of Babeuf," P151-156. Mises, "Socialism," P15-17, P72-73.

⁵ Hitler, 1930, from Carsten, "Rise of Fascism," P137.

⁶ Farrell, "Mussolini," Chapters 9 & 11.

I also argue that Fascism was a version of Socialism based on nationality rather than race, and make the case that National Socialism was not Fascism. They are similar, in that they both embrace Socialism on a national level, and the Fascists also paint themselves as somewhere between Capitalism and Marxism in 'Fascist Third Way'. But they are different because Mussolini and other Fascists didn't believe in the Racial Theory of History, and don't base their ideology on race. The National Socialists on the other hand, base their ideology on the race, rather than the nationality. (The race is the nation and the nation is the race.) Racism is fundamental to National Socialist ideology, and is *not* fundamental to Fascism (although some Fascists are racist, just like some Marxists are racist - Stalin, as an example).⁷ In fact, Hitler hated Italian Fascism, and despised Franco's Fascism - something many historians seem to ignore.⁸

There's a bit more to it than that, obviously, but in a nutshell, that's the premise of my argument.

⁷ Farrell, "Mussolini," Chapters 9 & 10. Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P257-268. Mosley, "Fascism 100 Questions," P8. Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P413-5.

⁸ von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, "Leftism," P173. Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P26-28, P434-439.

Section 2: Definitions

Part 1: Socialism and Capitalism

I spent an hour and forty-two minutes in my "Public vs Private" video (backed up by sources at the bottom of the screen and a list of sources at the beginning of that video) showing the history, the etymology, and evolution of the words 'Socialism' and 'Capitalism' from ancient times until today. (Some people actually called it the best video on the internet.) So, to not make *this* video longer than it needs to be, I'm *not* going to repeat all of that again here. What I am going to do is briefly explain the definitions, but if you disagree with them, or want a *detailed* explanation of these words, the link to that video will be in the description. I highly recommend that you watch that first before you continue, especially if you disagree with the definitions I'm about to give you.⁹

So, in brief, the definition of the word Capitalism is the "private control of the means of production". The word 'private' comes from the Latin 'privus' meaning 'individual' - as in, individual human being. This is why a private in the army is a single soldier. Private control also means non-state. Capitalism *is* anti-state, since it gives individuals or small family-like groups control of their means of production. Capitalism is against (or at least not in favour of) publicly-owned corporations, publicly-owned central banks, or publicly-owned central states. This is why the term 'State Capitalism' is oxymoronic, since capitalism is inherently non-state. This term - 'State Capitalism' - literally means 'state non-state', which is why it is right to reject it entirely, since it is an impossibility. Something that is 'false', cannot be 'true', and something that is inherently 'non-state' cannot be 'a state'. If people use the term 'state-capitalism', they're actually saying 'socialism'.¹⁰

Similarly, there are many different definitions of the word 'Socialism', ranging from 'collective control', 'group control', 'worker control', 'social control', 'national control' etc, all of them meaning the same thing - group control of the means of production. And I showed why all 'groups' are 'non-private'. Therefore they are 'public'. The word 'public' comes from the Latin 'publicus', meaning 'of the people' or 'of the state'. This Public Sector is the hierarchy of society. There can be multiple hierarchies competing with each other - like different local state 'councils' (or 'Soviets'), or different 'corporations' (which are collectively owned by their shareholders), or multiple trade unions vying for power... but they're all mini-states within the wider society of the central state. Therefore, Socialism is the public-sector control of the means of production, or - state control of the economy.¹¹

⁹ TIK "Public vs Private | The Historic Origins of the words Socialism & Capitalism"
https://youtu.be/ksAqr4ILA_Y

¹⁰ Mises, "Socialism," P11-12, P15. (2nd ed 1969, 1st ed 1922)
"The Oxford Dictionary of English," Oxford University Press, Third Edition 2010. P1413.
"Cambridge Dictionary" <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/private-sector>

¹¹ Oxford Dictionary of English, Oxford University Press, Third Edition 2010. P350-351, P775, P1181, P1435, P1694.
Cambridge Dictionary <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/public>

Part 2: The Definition Debate

So these are the historic definitions of capitalism and socialism. But socialists disagree. They deny any definition of socialism, and contradict each other in the process. For example, there were *three* socialists who defined socialism at roughly 1 hour and 35 minutes into a debate on one of Sargon of Akkad's videos. The first defined socialism as "the collective ownership of the means of production", which he says is the classic Marxist definition. He then listed the Soviet Union, China, Eastern European Countries, and Cuba as all socialist countries. His definition is funny because it contradicts at least one of the other socialists in that debate. And the final socialist was so great at defining socialism that he failed to even do so at that time, but later admitted it was worker-control of the means of production.¹²

But it is true. Socialism is the 'collective ownership of the means of production'. To use Karl Marx's definition for his Marxist-version of Socialism, socialism is -

"...socialised man, the associated producers, rationally regulating their interchange with Nature, bringing it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it as by the blind forces of Nature..."¹³

This is a lot of fancy language deliberately designed to hide the true meaning of the words. But, as I explained in detail in the Public vs Private video, the definition is there. To boil it down into plain language, Marx says socialism is - a group of people, the workers, controlling the economy together, instead of being ruled by the natural economy. In other words, collective control of the means of production. And again, a collective is a group, which is public, which is state. So, the word "collective" is just a word to hide the true meaning of the word 'state'. Socialism, therefore, in its truest and most plainest-language definition, is state control of the economy.

Of course, most Socialists don't like to admit that totalitarian state-control of the economy is what Socialism is, and so they try to hide behind other words. This has got to the point where they even claim Socialism is the truest form of Democracy, since the people are all supposedly volunteering to submit themselves to the slavery of the central state. This is why Marxist-Socialist North Korea can call itself 'democratic', because technically by the socialist definition, it is democratic.¹⁴ Interestingly, the Fascists and National Socialists also use the exact same logic to claim that their totalitarian Socialist dictatorships are also the highest form of democracy.¹⁵

Online Latin-Dictionary <http://www.latin-dictionary.net/definition/32212/publicus-publica-publicum>

Online Etymology Dictionary <https://www.etymonline.com/word/public>

¹² See 1h 35 mins into "Debate: Socialism vs Capitalism," Sargon of Akkad Live, <https://youtu.be/z6gB3gA9UZg>

¹³ Marx/Engels, "Das Kapital v3," P593.

¹⁴ Hayek, "The Road to Serfdom," P59-74. Niemietz, "Socialism: The Failed Idea that Never Dies," P17-20, P132-154. Nitti, "Bolshevism, Fascism and Democracy," P138.

¹⁵ Birchall, "The Spectre of Babeuf," P156-159. Diorenzo, "The Problem with Socialism," Chapter 1. Farrell, "Mussolini," Chapter 10. Gentile, "Origins and Doctrine of Fascism," P31. Mises, "Socialism,"

Marxist Socialists claim to know their ideology inside and out, and say that I don't know what their ideology is, even though I used to be a socialist myself and understand some of their literature better than they do. It turns out that many of them don't know the definition of their own ideology, claiming it has nothing to do with the 'state', since Marx and Engels said that the 'state' would 'wither away' or 'die away'. But again, I tackled this successfully in the Public vs Private video.

In one hostile response, someone ridiculed me for saying that Marx was calling for anarcho-capitalism. I think he must have missed the very next sentence where I said, "or he's lying". Marx and Engels did say that the State would die away. But there's a couple of things to note. First, it requires the setting up of a totalitarian state in order for the totalitarian state to wither away. Secondly, since a state is 'of the people' - meaning, it is the hierarchy of society consisting of the people - when Marx and Engels say that the state will die away, they are literally saying that society will die away too. Which means, you no longer have the hierarchy of society - you have anarchism - and you have every individual fending for himself in control of his own economy. Individual control of his economy is Capitalism. So yes, Marx is literally saying that Socialism will die away and we will be left with anarcho-capitalism.

And then I said, "or he's lying". Marx and Engels are calling for totalitarian state-control of society, knowing full-well that the state won't wither away at all. They're just promising you that it will. *Of course I'll give you a million dollars if you watch until the end of the video, don't worry, keep watching.* It's an empty promise and there's no reason to assume it's true, or that it will actually happen. More likely, once all power is collected into the hands of Marx and Engels, or Lenin, or Stalin, or Hitler, or Mao, they will be in total control and will dominate every aspect of the lives of the people they have enslaved. At this point, the people will have no choice but to obey their masters as they keep promising them "don't worry, paradise will come soon". In fact, this is exactly what Lenin and Stalin did. They had to explain to the starving people of the Soviet Union that, '*no this isn't the paradise of Communism. We're currently in Socialism, which is the transition into Communism, and we haven't got there yet.*' This is despite the fact that until they themselves actually said this, the words 'Communism' and 'Socialism' meant the exact same thing and were synonyms of each other.

So, Marx and Engels are promising that totalitarianism will wither away once it's set up, and they're doing this to reassure the critics or the doubters that their future paradise will not look like a boot stamping on a human face - forever.¹⁶

"We know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means, it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship."¹⁷

P62, P67-73. Nitti, "Bolshevism, Fascism and Democracy," P138. Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P391-396.

¹⁶ Orwell, "Nineteen Eighty-Four," P280.

¹⁷ O'Brien, from Orwell, "Nineteen Eighty-Four," P276.

"For neither Lenin nor Marx was the revolution the answer to the question: what can be done for the proletariat? Rather the proletariat was the answer to the question: what can be done for the revolution?"¹⁸

Marxists are self-blind to this, as they are to their own Doublethink. Many Marxists laughed when I said "Hitler was a Socialist because he wanted to 'socialize the people' by removing the Jews from society". They asked, *what does the phrase 'socialize the people' even mean?* They said, *that doesn't have anything to do with socialism!*

It's funny how Marxists don't have any issue with the phrase "socialized man" when Marx uses it. A group of people banding together into a society, is what "socialized man" means. So Marx wants a group of people - in this case, the workers - to band together into a society. And yet, when I say that Hitler wanted to do the same thing - "socialize the people" - many Marxist Socialists are suddenly unable to grasp this concept.¹⁹

So let me try and put it in as simple a way as possible for you. Marx wanted the workers to socialize. Hitler wanted the German race to socialize. Marx wanted a worker collective. Hitler wanted a race collective. Marx and Lenin wanted a "dictatorship of the proletariat". Hitler wanted a "People's State". Marx wanted a *class* socialism. Hitler wanted a *race* socialism.²⁰

Marxists may fall back on the idea that Socialism is not about race, but is only about the workers. However, 'Socialism' pre-dates Marxism. The original 'Socialism' was not about class at all. Socialism was the 'collective in control of the means of production'. Well, that has nothing to do with class. Socialism was, the collective, or the public sector 'state' control of the economy. You can have a worker's state, or a racial state. You can have any type of state. Just because Marxism is (supposedly) for the workers (which it isn't) doesn't mean that it's Socialism. It's only Socialism when it calls for State control of the economy.

Also, this idea that Marxism has nothing to do with race is equally incorrect.

"The capitalist knows that all commodities, however scurvy they may look, or however badly they may smell, are in faith and in truth money, inwardly circumcised Jews, and what is more, a wonderful means whereby out of money to make more money."²¹

That's right, Marx despised the Jews and thought capitalism was Jewish. And Hitler thought the exact same thing.

"... because this capital is international, its holders, the Jews, are international because of their being spread all over the world. And here everyone should actually throw up their hands in despair and say to themselves, if this capital is international

¹⁸ Muravchik, "Heaven on Earth," P114.

¹⁹ Marx, "Das Kapital V3," P593.

²⁰ Brown, "How 'socialist' was National Socialism?" Kindle.

²¹ Marx, "Das Kapital V1," P107.

because its holders, the Jews, are spread internationally all over the world, then it must be insanity to think that one will be able to fight this capital of the same members of this race internationally..."²²

And Marx is not only calling for the socialization of the people, he's calling for the removal of the Jews from society.

"As soon as society succeeds in abolishing the empirical essence of Judaism - huckstering and its conditions - the Jew becomes impossible, because his consciousness no longer has an object... The social emancipation of the Jew is the emancipation of society from Judaism."²³

And let's not forget that Hitler had read Marx's Das Kapital, which he says was what convinced him that he was in a fight against "a real international and stock-exchange capital" which he believed was being run by the Jews.²⁴

"No wonder Goebbels declared eighty years later that all socialism is antiSemitism."²⁵

So, I think it's quite ironic that some Marxists accused me of being a "Jew-hater", having zero evidence to back that accusation up, and only relying on the mistaken belief that National Socialism was Capitalism (which it isn't). In reality, given what we have just seen, it would be fair to say that Socialism is inherently anti-Semitic. And this makes sense, given the fact that Socialism is designed to divide society into hostile groups in order to exploit them and allow the accusers a chance to gain power. Workers vs their bosses. Aryans vs Jews. Men vs Women. The list goes on.

Now, as I explained in the Public vs Private video, when you collectivise the people in this way, they become the governing body of whatever territory they're on. So, they become the 'state'. Marxist-Fascists rejected my definition of the word 'state', even though I gave the Oxford dictionary definition of the word.

"State noun, a nation or territory considered as an organized political community under one government."²⁶

An organized political community on a piece of territory - such as a collective farm - would be classed as a state. But this was simply rejected. Well, for starters, the reason the dictionary exists is so that you can use it to learn the meanings of words. If you reject the language that we speak, deciding that words do not mean what they mean, then we're not going to be able to communicate. This was the original issue - Socialists didn't know the true meaning and definition of Socialism. I have gone back through the literature and the sources, all the way back to Ancient Greece and Rome, to confirm to you what it was, and it turns out that, yes,

²² Hitler, speech on 13 August 1920, quoted from Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P265.

²³ Karl Marx, "On the Jewish Question".

²⁴ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P198.

²⁵ von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, "Leftism," P137.

²⁶ "The Oxford Dictionary of English," Oxford University Press, Third Edition 2010. P1741.

Socialists never say what *real* Socialism is, because they don't know what *real* Socialism is. If they did know what Socialism was, and if they understood basic economics, they wouldn't be Socialists. That's why I'm no longer a Socialist, because I did my homework.

But Marxists rejected this definition of 'state', not just because they didn't actually know the dictionary definition, but because they said, in theory, the given definition would mean that, when a guy owns his own factory, that he would be a 'state'. Or, he would be a dictator.

There's two points to this. First, the word 'politics' comes from the Greek word 'polites' meaning 'citizen'. The origin of that is 'polis', meaning 'city'. If you watch my Public vs Private video, you will see how a city is 'Public' because it is the hierarchy of society. So, to be political, is to relate to the running of the hierarchy that dominates society.²⁷ This means that, because the factory owner is not relating to the running of the hierarchy that dominates society, a private owner of a factory is not political, and technically he is not a state, since the definition requires a 'political' community.

Secondly, even if we reject this technical definition, and assume that the factory owner is a mini-dictator of his factory, and thus this is a 'state'. Okay, well, how many people work for him? A couple hundred? He has a *tiny* hierarchy or 'state'. Anyone in his state can leave at any moment, and nobody is being *forced* to comply with his 'state'. So, he is no threat to anyone. This is why I don't fear the factory owner. I don't fear the owner of a corner shop, or a restaurant chain. I don't fear them at all, because the worst they can do to me is sack me, sell me a bad product, or I'd have one-guy being hostile towards me.

Compare this to the hierarchy of the public state, which can send armed thugs to kick down my door, kidnap me and throw me in a cage, steal my wealth through the power of taxation or inflation, drag me off to a slave labour camp, or execute me. The public state has a lot more power than one guy who owns a small business or factory.

Similarly, when the workers rise up to collectively take over the factory, they're a mob that becomes the state. A dictatorship of the proletariat. They've already violently overthrown the factory owner, so it's not like they're unwilling to be violent again. They could do the same to you or me. And even if they're a supposed 'democracy', as Socrates found out, the dictatorship of the majority can force the minority to drink their poison. This collective control, this slavery to the majority, the group tyranny, is the essence of socialism.

So even if one individual is a state, the power of the individual is limited to his or her property. Thus, Capitalism is natural freedom of the individual. Instead of being owned by either someone else, or the collective, you could own your own home. You could own your own workshop and produce things for society. You don't need to bow to another private individual, or the public collective. By being self-employed, and owning your own property, you're not dominated by anyone else. You're free to do what you want in your own domain. And if you need something from someone else, you can make a trade for it. This freedom, this private control, is the essence of capitalism.

²⁷ "The Oxford Dictionary of English," Oxford University Press, Third Edition 2010. P1374.

Section 3: The Value Debate

Part 1: Value in Society

Socialists claim that Capitalism is inherently evil and will collapse, ushering in a Socialist paradise. The reason Capitalism is evil is because some people have more than others, and some people who are at the bottom have less than others; thus it is not *fair*.

Now, Capitalism does not mean that each of us necessarily owns a factory, or a home, right now. But what it does mean is that, if we work hard and produce things that our community *wants* - if we produce goods or services that other people *value* - we will be rewarded by those other people. The community around us will reward us for giving to the community. All men are islands. And the only way to *receive* value, is to *provide* value to the other islands. The only way to get rich, is to *give* people what they want.

For example, I have a microphone, and a camera. And I work hard to produce videos, which I provide for the community. I provide something of value to you *for free*. And the community values what I produce - to such an extent - that they're willing to support me in making these videos. I don't even ask. The links are there in the description. The list of names of those who support me rises in every video. I say thank you for supporting me and making this happen, and I explain how your support will help me get more quality videos to you. But I don't beg anyone to do this. These people have decided to do this on their own, because they think my work is valuable. So I give to the community, and the community gives back to me. Capitalism.

Another example. Jeff Bezos, the guy in charge of Amazon, is really really rich. But why? Well, Jeff Bezos wants to collect banknotes or digits on a screen. And the best part is, he can collect my currency if he wants to, so long as he gives me history books in return I'm happy to give him all my currency. Over half of the United States is on Amazon Prime, apparently, and they're willingly giving their currency to Amazon in exchange for the goods and services that Amazon provides. So Jeff Bezos is rich because he provides for his community, and the community rewards him for that. This isn't evil. This is millions of people working together and rewarding each other with things they want. Jeff wants currency, you want Jeff's products. If you want currency, provide people with products they want.

And Jeff built Amazon up *from scratch*. So Socialists cannot say - *well, he deserves to have his business and wealth stolen from him by a bunch of people who work in his warehouses*. No he doesn't. He worked hard and made his own business. Nobody should take that from him. If they don't like it, they can do what he did - set up their own businesses. I've done it. Millions of people have done it. And I'd like to see more people do it too.

Some have argued that Jeff Bezos's business wasn't built by him, but by the workers. They're the ones who did the physical work of putting his warehouses up, and so on. Except, Jeff Bezos was the one who organized the entire effort, and he was the one who started the

business. He worked hard, founded his own business, and provided for his society. He was rewarded for doing that by society, and was then able to hire people to help build the buildings that housed his business. The people who built Jeff's business were paid for a particular service. They didn't build his business - he did. They were contracted to perform certain tasks, and he paid them for that. They were rewarded for doing work, by Jeff, and their contract was fulfilled. They have no claim on his business because they did not build it, he did. They did not deliver the products to the door of the houses who's owners ordered products off of the website. Jeff did. They *physically* did the work, but they did it on Jeff's behalf, and he paid them for that work. If you hire a guy to install a roof on your house, the roofer doesn't then own your roof. He build your roof for you, and got paid for the job. It's your roof, not his.

Many of us don't have our own businesses. And that's because we haven't done what Jeff did. We haven't worked hard, and saved hard, building up the capital to create our own businesses. We haven't provided the same amount of value to our society, because if we had, we would've been rewarded by society for it.

Now, some might say that we're working hard in our current jobs. And we might be. But that doesn't mean we're providing the same amount of value to society as other people. There's no point working hard on something nobody wants. There's no point making mud and then crying when nobody buys it.

Anybody can work at McDonalds. Working at McDonalds does not require skill, and doesn't provide much benefit to society. Again, that doesn't mean McDonalds staff are not working hard, or that I don't respect what they do. But if I compared a typical McDonalds staff-member to an airplane pilot, there's no question to me that an airplane pilot provides more value to society than a single McDonalds employee. Not only do I know this, simply by reason alone, that there's fewer people able to fly planes than people able to ask if I want fries with that, but also, airplane pilots get paid more for their work. Why? Well, society thinks there's more value having someone capable of flying a plane full of passengers, thousands of feet in the sky, and land us safely to where we want to go, and so society is willing to pay for that ability. In fact, I hope they do get paid more than McDonalds employees, because I want pilots to have an incentive to do a good job, and not fail us when we're up in the air.

So, in essence, you get paid for what worth you're providing to society. This is why the workers don't '*deserve*' the factories that they physically built but do not own, nor do they deserve a pay grade artificially higher than what the market will pay for their work. If you want to get paid more by society, then you need to provide society with more value than you're currently doing. That's not easy, but that is the solution.

Part 2: Labour vs Subjective Theories of Value

Now, the reason many Socialists don't understand the concept I've just outlined is because they believe in what's known as the 'Labour Theory of Value'. They argue that the value of something is based on the amount of work that went into creating it, averaged over society.

This is not true. Also, the problem, they say, is that because value is fixed, the capitalists can only make money if they steal from the workers. This is also not true. I've actually tackled this theory before, so I'm just going to copy a section from my Public vs Private video.²⁸

In a nutshell: Marxists believe that hiring someone else to work for you and paying them for that work is capitalism and, even though they have volunteered to work for you and have agreed to the wage and can always leave and go live in the woods or something, it's also exploitation. In their mind, the reason it's exploitation is because of the Labour Theory of Value. This is the idea that a product gains its value based on how many hours it took to make it. So, if it took you five hours to make a pile of mud, that pile of mud is worth five hours of wages. And if you happened to find a diamond on the floor, the diamond is worth nothing because you didn't put any effort into making it.

Since everything has a set value, you cannot change higher than the value. A car that took 10 hours to make, is worth 10 hours wage. You cannot sell it for higher than that, so the only way for anyone to make profit is to pay the workers less than their worth.

So, let's say that you slave away for 10 hours to make a car, and the evil factory owner sells the car for \$100. That means that your wage should be \$10 per hour. But the evil factory owner can't pay you \$100 because he wants profit, so instead he gives you \$20 (for a rate of \$2 per hour) and pockets the other \$80, which is his profit. So, under the Labour Theory of Value, the evil factory owner makes evil profit by paying you less than your worth.

The problem, of course, is that goods are subjective in value. The Subjective Theory of Value came AFTER Marx wrote *Das Kapital*. And without the Labour Theory of Value to prop it up, Marxism basically loses its entire substance. Under the Subjective Theory of Value, you might slave away for 10 hours to make a car, which could get sold for \$20,000... or not sold at all. Either way, you get paid for the hours you agreed to work building the car, regardless whether the car is sold or not.

Regardless whether the owner makes profit or not, you still get paid. He's taking the risk with his business, you are not. And if you don't like your job, nothing is stopping you from walking out the doors and finding a better paying job, or make your own car factory, or your own business. Nothing says you have to work for anybody else. Save up some money from your wages, become self-employed, and see how the world *really* works.

But yes, this whole idea that hiring someone is exploitative is just a ridiculous and outdated view of how the economy works.²⁹

²⁸ <https://fee.org/articles/were-still-haunted-by-the-labor-theory-of-value/>

²⁹ TIK "Public vs Private | The Historic Origins of the words Socialism & Capitalism"
https://youtu.be/ksAqr4ILA_Y

In reality, value is subjective - everyone makes a subjective, individual, assessment of the value of a good or service. You can see this on YouTube. My videos take a long time to make. This video has a 41,000 word script. Most vlogging videos don't even have a script. Maybe they say a couple thousand words... maybe? Yet they receive many times more views than my videos. Why? Surely, if the Labour Theory of Value is correct, then society would value my videos way way way more than the average vlogging video. Look at Operation Crusader - a nine and a half hour documentary about a battle in North Africa; tons of work went into that video, which is currently the most in-depth and lengthy World War Two history documentary currently in existence - and yet it only gets a few thousand views. Why? Because not many people are interested in in-depth history documentaries on an obscure (but amazingly awesome and funny) battle in the North African Desert. This video - one of my best - isn't as valued as my 15-minute long "Rations at Stalingrad" video, which took me barely any time to make, and I even dropped some of the bread in the video. Apart from the research, the only planning I had to do was buy a loaf of bread, and borrow cigarettes off my mum because I don't smoke. Yet, apparently, lots more people value short and stupid videos like that more than they do epic battle documentaries. It's no wonder the History Channel became the Alien Conspiracy Channel. Subjectively, people value Alien Conspiracy videos more than good high-quality history content.

So as you can see, value doesn't come from the amount of work that goes into a video. If it did, Operation Crusader would probably be one of the top videos on the platform. Instead, people value vlogging videos more. In my videos, the Labour is there in spades, but the value is not (to the same extent). And the reason why is because *subjectively*, history videos are not as valued as vlogging videos by the majority of the people. Individuals value videos based on many different factors - not the labour time that went into it, averaged across society. Value is therefore *subjective*, not *labour*.

Section 4: The Crisis of Capitalism?

Part 1: The “Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall” (Fallacy)

Hitler believed in the Shrinking Markets, which is basically a variant on the Marxist “Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall” concept. In my Shrinking Markets video, I called this concept a “fallacy”, and this did not go down well with Marxists.³⁰

We must bear in mind that the arguments for the fallacy’s very existence are... illogical, to say the least. The fundamental problem is that this fallacy requires the ‘Labour Theory of Value’ in order to function. As we have shown, the Labour Theory of Value is an incorrect value system, so we know, by a priori reasoning, that the Profit to Fall Fallacy must be inherently flawed. Since value is subjective, then so is labour, and so is profit. If profit is subjective, then there’s no reason to suppose the rate of profit will fall over time as the name of the theory suggests, and there’s no reason to think that the workers are having their wealth stolen off them by their employers, as the fallacy goes on to claim.

Now, I could sit here for a while explaining all the different inherent problems with the fallacy, even if we assume it’s true. But that’s been done already by numerous people. Instead, for the sake of brevity, I will choose just one argument to present to you here. If you want to look into this further, the references at the bottom of the screen will provide you with more answers to the problem of this fallacy.³¹

So, here’s one argument - If a capitalist knew that he would make more profit by decreasing productivity, why would he raise productivity? Surely, if he knew profit would fall, he would actively seek to sabotage his own factory? He would hire the least productive workers, and fire all researchers and engineers trying to come up with ways of raising productivity. Capitalists wouldn’t invest in larger production if there was an economic law that forced them to make lower profits over time. They wouldn’t invest in the future, which is exactly what they’re doing by creating mass production factories and businesses. If I knew that profits would fall as I produced *more* YouTube videos, then I’d have an incentive not to boost output of my YouTube videos. The reality, of course, is that the value of each YouTube video is subjective, which means that the more I produce, the higher chance I have of producing videos which resonate more with my viewers, which will then increase their value, not decrease them. In fact, if we thought profit would fall as we increased productivity, we’d all

³⁰ TIK, “The REAL Reason why Hitler HAD to start WW2,” <https://youtu.be/PQGMjDQ-TJ8>
 TIK, “Why they don’t tell you about Hitler’s “Shrinking Markets” problem,”
<https://youtu.be/go2OFpO8fy0>

³¹ Woods, T. “The Anti-Marxist Argument That Clinches It.” <https://youtu.be/ffq-8qr6avg>
 Keen, S. “Use-Value, Exchange-Value, and the Demise of Marx’s Labor Theory of Value.” PDF, P9.
 Manish, G. “Labor and Capitalist Exploitation: Böhm-Bawerk and the Close of Marx’s System”
<https://mises.org/wire/labor-and-capitalist-exploitation-bohm-bawerk-and-close-marxs-system>

still be living in the woods, since any productivity at all is therefore worse than no productivity. Clearly then, the Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall fallacy is just stupid.³²

Part 2: Capitalism is Failing?

Without the Labour Theory of Value, you do not have the Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall idea. Without that, not only are workers not being exploited by their employers, but capitalism isn't going to fall. Or, at least, it won't fall for this reason. There is no 'crisis of capitalism', as the Socialists claim. The Revolution is not inevitable. And Bernstein understood this. Bernstein was the socialist who was originally asked by Engels to complete Das Kapital Volume 4, but this was before he deviated from the 'true' Marxist faith.³³

"More than fifty years had passed since Marx and Engels formulated their sociological forecast that the rich would become fewer, the poor poorer and the middle classes negligible. Bernstein observed that something nearly opposite had occurred: the rich were more numerous, as were the middle classes, and the poor were better off. He focused on the prediction that capital would become ever more concentrated, apparently because data on this was easy to come by. He was able to show that the number of small businesses was growing and so was the number of well-off people. Indeed, as a result of research in economic history it is now estimated that per capita income in Germany and England, adjusted for inflation, had roughly doubled between the publication of Communist Manifesto in 1848 and of Evolutionary Socialism in 1899. Such statistics were not available to Bernstein, but the practical evidence of changes in standard of living were observable all round."³⁴

The amount of meat the average person consumed basically doubled between 1873 and 1912. Sugar consumption tripled between 1870 and 1907. Beer consumption grew by 57% between 1872 and 1900.³⁵

"The implications for Marxian theory were profound. The progressive reduction of society to just two classes, one small and immensely rich and the other vast and utterly impoverished, was to form the crucible of social transformation. Without that process, as [Rosa] Luxemburg had pointed out, there was no reason to expect a socialist revolution. Socialism was still possible, but it would have to be brought about by human will, not by impersonal historical forces, and therefore it would have to be justified because it was desirable, not because it was inevitable."³⁶

At the time, none of the opponents of Bernstein had been able to prove that Bernstein's view, that the proletariat weren't evolving the way that Marx and Engels had predicted, was

³² https://enacademic.com/dic.nsf/enwiki/1648092/Tendency_of_the_rate_of_profit_to_fall

³³ Muravchik, "Heaven on Earth," P100-101.

³⁴ Muravchik, "Heaven on Earth," P105.

³⁵ Muravchik, "Heaven on Earth," P105.

³⁶ Muravchik, "Heaven on Earth," P105.

wrong. (In fact, they still haven't.) This was why Lenin realized that he had to start the Revolution himself, because if he did not start it, it would never come.³⁷

"In the year or so after reading Bernstein's book, Lenin formulated an answer... that was to change forever the face of socialism. Most workers might not be growing poorer or more ready to overthrow the system, but the "proletarian revolution" did not need to be carried out by proletarians; it could be done for them!"³⁸

As Lenin himself wrote -

"... not a single Marxist has understood Marx!"³⁹

Lenin decided that the Revolution was what Marxism was all about.

"For neither Lenin nor Marx was the revolution the answer to the question: what can be done for the proletariat? Rather the proletariat was the answer to the question: what can be done for the revolution?"⁴⁰

Violent overthrow of the current regime and the establishment of a Lenin-state which gave him totalitarian control over the workers, whether they wanted it or not. And this wasn't inevitable any more, but desirable. Lenin wasn't interested in helping the working class, or even his fellow Socialists. He was only interested in one thing - power.

"Be firm. If there are wavering among the Socialists who came over to you yesterday, or among the petty bourgeois, in regard to the dictatorship of the proletariat, suppress the wavering mercilessly. Shooting is the proper fate of a coward in war."⁴¹

All this was because Lenin had realized that The Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall was indeed a fallacy. He had realized that capitalism may not fall by itself. And indeed, it didn't. The reason the Russian Revolution happened was because of the First World War. A war between different States. It wasn't a war between private citizens, it was a war between multiple public sector hierarchies, which took the opportunity to take more and more resources from the production industries and consume them in violent conflict. The result was impoverishment of the private sector by the public sector, leading to rebellion. Lenin used this societal breakdown to his advantage. And once he was in power, he did everything he could to stay in power, which meant he had to steal as much grain as possible from the peasants to feed his revolution. To Marxists in one province, Lenin wrote -

³⁷ Muravchik, "Heaven on Earth," P107, P114.

³⁸ Muravchik, "Heaven on Earth," P107.

³⁹ Lenin, quoted from Muravchik, "Heaven on Earth," P113.

⁴⁰ Muravchik, "Heaven on Earth," P114.

⁴¹ Reference: Lenin to Bela Kun (Hungarian Revolutionary), from Muravchik, "Heaven on Earth," P140.

- “1. Hang (hang without fail, so the people see) no fewer than one hundred known kulaks, rich men, bloodsuckers
2. Publish their names.
3. Take from them all the grain.
4. Designate hostages...”⁴²

The peasants were condemned to starve in the name of the workers. If they resisted, they would be murdered.

“Some were shot, others drowned, some frozen or buried alive, and still others were hacked to death by swords.”⁴³

And this was when both the Whites *and* the Reds targeted Jews, in anti-Jewish pogroms. Yes, the Red Army attacked Jews, and this was under Lenin’s watch. Budyonny’s Red cavalry division committed many crimes against the Jews. His men stole possessions (including women’s underwear), tortured the men, and the general himself attempted to shoot one man who threatened to report him to the higher ups, only failing to do so when his pistol misfired. Rather than be punished by the Soviet Socialist system, Budyonny would later rise to the rank as Marshal of the Soviet Union, take part in the Second World War, and die in 1973 having completely got away with his crimes. In other Red cavalry units, the prettiest girls were simply taken - either in the streets, or carted off first. Polish people suffered a similar fate as Lenin exported the revolution abroad.⁴⁴ At the same time, the Red police - the Cheka - pillaged and plundered Soviet lands (and the people upon it) in much the same way.

“Historians only hazard guesses about the total, but in the Crimea... at the end of 1920, somewhere between 50,000 and 150,000 were shot or hanged. The witch hunt continued afterward, stoked by Lenin, who talked about how up to 300,000 more “spies and secret agents” in the Crimea should be tracked down and “punished”.⁴⁵

The peasants fought back against the requisition brigades sent to steal their food, burn their homes and collectively ‘Socialize’ their women. Tens of thousands took up arms, but were savagely crushed by the Marxists. Families of those who resisted were carted off to concentration camps - set up by Lenin. These were the precursors to the now infamous ‘Gulags’.⁴⁶

Meanwhile, the rest of the supposedly-‘capitalist’ world was doing just fine. You might recall that the 1920s was known as the roaring 20s, and even in the 1930s during the Great Depression (itself caused by Socialism) millions weren’t starving to death like they had under Lenin’s Socialism, or like they were doing under Stalin’s Socialism. And, far from the crisis of capitalism, it was the crisis of Socialism which led to the fall of the Soviet Union, Cambodia,

⁴² Lenin, 11th August 1917, from Gellately, “Lenin, Stalin and Hitler,” P53.

⁴³ Gellately, “Lenin, Stalin and Hitler,” P65.

⁴⁴ Engelstein, “Russia in Flames,” P532-539.

⁴⁵ Gellately, “Lenin, Stalin and Hitler,” P72.

⁴⁶ Gellately, “Lenin, Stalin and Hitler,” P74-75.

and, more recently, Venezuela. But Socialists claim none of it is *real* Socialism, even though it was - it was state control of the economy which caused the downfall of these nations.

So, as you can see, the Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall fallacy does not apply to capitalism, because capitalism is based upon the Subjective Theory of Value. Due to the *fact* that capitalism does not rely upon a Labour Theory of Value, the Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall fallacy does not apply to it.

But *Socialism* is based upon the Labour Theory of Value. As a result, *it is* subject to the Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall fallacy. Now, even though this fallacy doesn't really exist, *socialists* who believe in it, *really believe* in it. They understand that when an economy (especially one which has not yet implemented *full-socialism*) is in economic crisis, the only way for them to solve the problem is to conquer external markets. This is what *they* believe capitalist economies are doing. In their mind, profit, or wealth, comes directly from the exploitation of workers. So, in order to pay for social programs - like pensions or roads - they must exploit the workers. And this is something they don't want to do. So, unable to *produce* more wealth, they need to *take* more wealth from somewhere else. In Lenin's and Stalin's case, they simply renamed some of the workers as "kulaks" or "traitors" and shipped them to the slave labour Gulag camps to "exploit" their wealth there. But even this backfired. As the Germans discovered at Auschwitz, slave labour is 50 to 80 percent *less* productive as paid labour.⁴⁷

So, unable to exploit all the non-slaved workers, and relying upon a slave economy, their only other option is to seek new wealth and slaves from external markets. This is why Lenin was busy exporting Revolution abroad, conquering Living Space into Poland. And despite calling for "socialism in one country", Stalin conquered Living Space in the Baltic States, and tried to do the same with Finland. When the Soviets invaded Berlin and Eastern Europe, they ripped up everything they could get their hands on - machine tools, trains, trucks, bathtubs - and shipped it all back to the Soviet Union. Then they exploited the people of Eastern Europe for years. (They couldn't exploit their own workers, but they could exploit workers from other countries, although they did exploit their own workers as well.) So much for paradise.

In conclusion, it appears that Socialism is in crisis, not capitalism.

Part 3: The "Shrinking Markets" Debate

Some Marxists have claimed that the Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall fallacy is only for internal markets, not external markets. This therefore "refutes" what I said.

Well, first off, this argument assumes that I only said that the concept applies to external markets. That is incorrect, and is a total misrepresentation of what I said, as I will explain shortly. Secondly, as Rosa Luxemburg makes clear on Page 366 of Accumulation of Capital,

⁴⁷ Steinbacher, S. "Auschwitz," P53-54.

because of the supposed Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall problem, capitalism needs external markets in order to survive.⁴⁸ She later says -

"Capital requires to buy the products of, and sell its commodities to, all non-capitalist strata and societies."⁴⁹

She also says that -

"Capital must get the peasants to buy its commodities and will therefore begin by restricting peasant economy to a single sphere - that of agriculture..."⁵⁰

She calls the final stage - the "imperialist phase of capitalist accumulation". This is where the hinterland (home country) has fun out of its surplus value and must seek new markets abroad.⁵¹ For the Marxists, the west is industrialized, and the rest of the world is not. Therefore, in order for capitalism to survive, it must conquer new markets around the un-industrialized world. This is what they call 'imperialism', and is their explanation for it.

Well, the reason given as to why capitalist states must conquer external markets is because of the failure of the internal market. So when the Marxists say that the Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall is only for internal markets, not external, and that I, apparently, only said that the concept applies to external markets - well, this is simply not true. Yes, under the fallacy, an internal market is impacted, but then this impacts external markets because the home market seeks foreign markets to compensate. So the conquest of external markets is the consequence of the failure of the internal market, meaning that the fallacy of the Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall fallacy does impact external markets.

Then, some Marxists claim that capitalism in the Third Reich was failing, and thus the Germans conquered the East because of it, supposedly "proving" that Germany was capitalist during the Third Reich era. But the first thing to take note of here is that, even if Germany was capitalist (which it wasn't), that does not mean that the ideology of National Socialism was capitalist as well. What the Third Reich was, and what National Socialism was, are two separate things.

Stalin wages a war against the kulaks right into the mid 1930s. In fact, in 1936, only 89.6% of the farms in the Soviet Union were collectivised. Well, why not 100%? Why after nearly twenty years in power, did the Soviet Union still not implement full-Socialism? '*Clearly, it's because Marxist-Socialists are Capitalists!*' No, it's because it turns out that, despite waging war after war against the peasantry and killing millions of people, they had failed to implement *real* Socialism. It's not because they weren't socialist - it's because they were failures.⁵²

⁴⁸ Luxemburg, "The Accumulation of Capital," P366.

⁴⁹ Luxemburg, "The Accumulation of Capital," P386.

⁵⁰ Luxemburg, "The Accumulation of Capital," P395-396.

⁵¹ Luxemburg, "The Accumulation of Capital," P419.

⁵² Gellately, "Lenin, Stalin and Hitler," P228.

Similarly, when the National Socialists are only in power twelve years, six of which they are at war for the Living Space they need in order to sustain their *real* Socialism, the reason that they *don't* implement *real* Socialism is because they *failed* to implement it. It's not because they didn't aim to do it, or that they were Capitalist, or they weren't Socialist. No, it was just because they *failed* to implement it. The Marxist-Socialists in the Soviet Union had nearly twenty years to implement Socialism by this point and they couldn't do it, so why do you think Hitler could do it in six? In fact, he tried to do it in four, as the name "Four Year Plan" suggests. Compare this to the multiple Five Year Plans that Stalin attempted (even after the war), let alone the socialism during the 'Revolution' that Lenin tried to implement and failed to do so, and you can see that implementing *real* Socialism just wasn't realistic in as short of a time as Hitler had.

So by the Marxists' own reasoning, even if the Third Reich was capitalist, that does not mean that Hitler or his regime was, nor does it mean that National Socialism is capitalism. In fact, maybe if Germany *wasn't* fully-Socialist and was partly-Capitalist, that would explain why Hitler had to go East. Maybe, because he was a Socialist in power who understood the Marxist concept of the Shrinking Markets, that Germany's capitalist economy only had so long to go before it was done for. And, since Germany doesn't have enough land and resources that she needs to implement Socialism for her people, perhaps Hitler thought they needed to get that land and resources first *before* capitalism fails and is taken over by the "international Marxism in the Jewish and Stock Exchange parties", and then implement real-Socialism once they had the land.⁵³ You can't implement *real* Socialism without the resources to do so, after all.

So let's see if there's any evidence for this. First, in *Mein Kampf*, he makes it clear that the German racial community needs land.

"The foreign policy of a People's State must first of all bear in mind the duty of securing the existence of the race which is incorporated in this State. And this must be done by establishing a healthy and natural proportion between the number and growth of the population on the one hand and the extent and resources of the territory they inhabit, on the other. That balance must be such that it accords with the vital necessities of the people."⁵⁴

Notice, there's no talk about trade or profit here.

"What I call a *healthy* proportion is that in which the support of a people is guaranteed by the resources of its own soil and sub-soil. Any situation which falls short of this condition is none the less unhealthy even though it may endure for centuries or even a thousand years. Sooner or later, this lack of proportion must of necessity lead to the decline or even annihilation of the people concerned."⁵⁵

⁵³ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P324.

⁵⁴ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P581.

⁵⁵ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P581.

So, his people - his race - need more soil, otherwise they will die. There's no talk about trading for the food, which you would do under capitalism, or getting the soil in-order to then make a profit, as you would do under capitalism. Hitler just says soil must be taken for the *Germans* alone.

"Against all this we, National Socialists, must stick firmly to the aim that we have set for our foreign policy; namely, that the German people must be assured the territorial area which is necessary for it to exist on this earth."⁵⁶

"The territory on which one day our German peasants will be able to bring forth and nourish their sturdy sons will justify the blood of the sons of the peasants that has to be shed today."⁵⁷

Again, no talk about trading surplus food abroad, or making a profit. And, instead of embracing capitalism, Hitler rejects capitalism in his Second Book, saying -

"The sense of such an economic system lies in the fact that a nation produces more of certain vital commodities than it requires for its own use. It sells this surplus outside its own national community, and with the proceeds therefrom it procures those foodstuffs and also the raw materials which it lacks. Thus this kind of economics involves not only a question of production, but in at least as great a degree a question of selling. There is much talk, especially at the present time, about increasing production, but it is completely forgotten that such an increase is of value only as long as a buyer is at hand. Within the circle of a nation's economic life, every increase in production will be profitable to the degree that it increases the number of goods which are thus made available to the individual. Theoretically, every increase in the industrial production of a nation must lead to a reduction in the price of commodities and in turn to an increased consumption of them, and consequently put the individual Folk Comrade in a position to own more vital commodities. In practice, however, this in no way changes the fact of the inadequate sustenance of a nation as a result of insufficient soil. For, to be sure, we can increase certain industrial outputs, indeed many times over, but not the production of foodstuffs. Once a nation suffers from this need, an adjustment can take place only if a part of its industrial overproduction can be exported in order to compensate from the outside for the foodstuffs that are not available in the homeland. But an increase in production having this aim achieves the desired success only when it finds a buyer, and indeed a buyer outside the country. Thus we stand before the question of the sales potential, that is, the market, a question of towering importance."⁵⁸

So basically, capitalism is not going to resolve the "soil crisis" for the German people. Hitler then talks about the Shrinking Markets, which sounds very similar to Marx's and Rosa Luxemborg's 'crisis of capitalism' theory caused by the 'Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall' fallacy -

⁵⁶ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P582.

⁵⁷ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P582.

⁵⁸ Hitler, "Second Book," P26.

"The present world commodity market is not unlimited. The number of industrially active nations has steadily increased. Almost all of the European nations suffer from an inadequate and unsatisfactory relation between soil and population. Hence they are dependent on world export. In recent years the American Union has turned to export, as has also Japan in the east. Thus a struggle automatically begins for the limited markets, which becomes tougher the more numerous the industrial nations become and conversely, the more the markets shrink. For while on the one hand the number of nations struggling for the world market increases, the commodity market itself slowly diminishes, partly in consequence of a process of self-industrialization on their own power, partly through a system of branch enterprises which are more and more coming into being in such countries out of sheer capitalistic interest..."

"The more purely capitalistic interests begin to determine the present economy, the more the general viewpoints of the financial world and the stock exchange achieve a decisive influence here, the more will this system of branch establishments reach out and thus artificially carry out the industrialisation of former commodity markets and especially curtail the export possibilities of the European mother countries. Today many can still afford to smile over this future development, but as it makes further strides, within thirty years people in Europe will groan under its consequences.

"The more market difficulties increase, the more bitterly will the struggle for the remaining ones be waged. Although the primary weapons of this struggle lie in pricing and in the quality of the goods with which nations competitively try to undersell each other, in the end the ultimate weapons even here lie in the sword."⁵⁹

So Hitler paints a clear picture that capitalism is dying, and as he says in *Mein Kampf*, this crisis will be exploited by "the Jews", and thus will bring in "international-Jewish-Marxism". So he's only got a limited amount of time to implement his version of socialism.⁶⁰

"The trend of development which we are now experiencing would, if allowed to go on unhampered, lead to the realization of the Pan-Jewish prophecy that the Jews will one day devour the other nations and become lords of the earth."⁶¹

And, in order to implement his version of socialism, he will have to destroy 'international-Jewish-Marxist-Capitalism'.

"For a fight it will have to be, since the first objective will not be to build up the idea of the People's State but rather to wipe out the Jewish State which is now in existence. As so often happens in the course of history, the main difficulty is not to establish a new order of things but to clear the ground for its establishment."⁶²

⁵⁹ Hitler, "Second Book," P26-28

⁶⁰ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P306-307, P556. Hitler, "Second Book," P26-28. Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P15-16, P135-137, P212-215, P231-239, P264-266, P274-282, P422-427.

⁶¹ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P410.

⁶² Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P410.

And there you go. Hitler saying *before he got into power* that he was going to destroy the “Jewish State” (meaning the Bolsheviks in the Soviet Union, and ‘international Jewish capital’) *before* he was going to implement his version of Socialism. He can’t implement full-socialism, and/or full-Autarky, without clearing the ground first, and without taking the Living Space and resources of the East. (‘Autarky’ meaning ‘economic self-sufficiency’ and is closely tied with the idea of socialism, which is why Lenin and Stalin, as well as syndicalists in Spain, also tried to implement it.) The point being - he has to conquer the East (destroying the “Jewish State”) before he can bring in Socialism.

“How could a large land empire thrive and dominate in the modern world without reliable access to world markets and without much recourse to naval power [Britain]? Stalin and Hitler had arrived at the same basic answer to this fundamental question. The state must be large in territory and self-sufficient in economics, with a balance between industry and agriculture that supported a hardily conformist and ideologically motivated citizenry capable of fulfilling historical prophecies - either Stalinist internal industrialization or Nazi colonial agrarianism. Both Hitler and Stalin aimed at imperial autarky, within a large land empire well supplied in food, raw materials, and mineral resources.”⁶³

“For Hitler... the strategy of economic expansion was a necessary outcome of the already existing incongruity between *Lebensraum* [Living Space] and population. In order to bring both factors back into line again, and to realize an autarkic large-area economy, the conquest of new *Lebensraum* was first necessary. But before this *Lebensraum* had been conquered, autarky could not be realized, from which it follows that trade had to continue, and therefore competition... We are dealing here with a *circulus vitiosus* of which Hitler was certainly well aware. His solution: by first employing emergency measures, for example the production of synthetic raw materials and the substitution of such raw materials that would otherwise have to be imported, to achieve a limited ‘temporary’ autarky and thereby create the conditions... for war. After the conquest of *Lebensraum* in the East, a true autarky which could be maintained in the long-term could be created out of the ‘temporary’ autarky with the aid of the raw material and agricultural areas now available. The ‘temporary’ autarky was therefore only an emergency solution.”⁶⁴

A limited ‘temporary’ Autarky (or Socialism) was to be achieved as a result of the Four Year Plan. Full-Autarky would come after the conquest of Living Space when a pan-European economic order could be established.⁶⁵ Now, no one in their right mind is going to say - *well, Hitler didn't implement full-Autarky, therefore he didn't want Autarky*. And for the same reason, no one can seriously suggest that just because he was waiting until after he conquered Living Space before implementing full-Socialism, that therefore he wasn't a Socialist. That would be a fundamental misinterpretation of Hitler's intentions.

⁶³ Snyder, “Blood Lands,” P158.

⁶⁴ Zitelmann, “Hitler: The Policies of Seduction,” P286-287.

⁶⁵ Zitelmann, “Hitler: The Policies of Seduction,” P286-290.

Bottom line: Hitler needed the resources of the East in order to bring in the full-socialism he desired. Even if the Third Reich was capitalist (which it wasn't), that still wouldn't mean that Hitler wasn't a Socialist, just because he failed to conquer the resources of the East which he needed to implement his socialism. Hitler failed to bring in Socialism because he was a failure, not because he was a capitalist.

Part 4: 'Fascist Imperialism' Debunked

In their counterarguments, Marxists have claimed that imperialism was a form of capitalism. And they say Fascism is capitalism, thus 'Fascist Imperialism' is a thing, and that Hitler's conquest of Living Space was 'capitalist-Fascist imperialism'. They then conclude that capitalism is evil. Well, even if we fully-accept the Marxist reasoning here - that capitalism resulted in Fascist Imperialism - they're still wrong.

"The realization that for Hitler the conquest of *Lebensraum* in the East was not a means of 're-agrarianization', and that he specifically regarded Russia as a source of raw material and a market, will certainly be drawn upon by Marxist historians as support for the thesis of a 'Fascist imperialism'. What speaks against such an interpretation is, as we have shown above, the argument that Hitler roundly rejected the exploitation of these sources of raw materials in the service of private capital profit interests [in the Marxist sense] and advocated instead that the economy of the East should be organized by the state from the very beginning. How far this would still permit an argument in the direction of 'state monopoly capitalism', cannot be discussed here."

Luckily though we rejected the term 'State Capitalism' for being oxymoronic long ago. 'State capitalism' just means Socialism.

"What should at least be noted is that Hitler, as his refusal to industrialize Russia demonstrates, clearly rejected the practice of capital export which was characteristic for the phase of monopoly capitalism."⁶⁶

So, even by their own logic, Marxists have misinterpreted this whole thing anyway. And I could go into the whole history of imperialism, explaining how it was implemented by collectively-owned (shareholder) corporations or by the public central-state, and thus wasn't capitalism, since collective control of the means of production is socialism - but I don't want to get bogged down here.

However, even if we used the Marxist pseudo-definition of capitalism here, and thus collective-shareholder controlled means of production (corporations) are somehow capitalist, it still isn't 'Fascist Imperialism'. The National Socialists aren't Fascists. And I don't care what Wikipedia says - they're not Fascists. It's two different ideologies. Fascists and National Socialists and Marxists all have Socialism in common - but that doesn't mean they are the

⁶⁶ Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P306.

same. National Socialists actually have more in common with the Marxists than they do the Fascists, since the National Socialists want to unify the *race* on an international level, just like the Marxists want to unify the *class* on an international level. Fascists only want to unify the nation.

So yes, the Marxists were correct that it was imperialism, but were wrong because it wasn't capitalist imperialism - it was socialist imperialism. To be specific, it was 'National Socialist Imperialism' that was heading East. The crisis of Socialism was to blame for National Socialist Imperialism, not capitalism.

Section 5: National Socialist Economic Ideology

Part 1: National Socialism's Fundamental Ideological Flaw

A lot of the counterarguments against the idea that Hitler's Socialism was *real* Socialism, fail to understand one vital aspect of Hitler's ideology, which explains why it is Socialism, and why it doesn't look the same as Marxist-Socialism. People don't know about the fundamental problem that Hitler has to face, which he never solved, and which other Socialisms can just dismiss. And because people don't know, Marxists can make the claim that the Nazis were capitalists, throw a few pieces of evidence at you that are completely out of context, and start smearing and slandering away. Well, such Marxists need to listen to what I'm about to say, because grasping Hitler's decision to just ignore the fundamental ideological flaw in his ideology will, in turn, completely annihilate the counterargument that states 'Hitler's Socialism was capitalism'.

So here we go. Apart from the obvious fact that National Socialism has racism built into it, and demands the destruction or enslavement of what it deems to be "inferior" races, and calls for totalitarian Socialism, the ideology itself is based on a contradiction. In order to get you to understand it, I need to explain Hitler's racism again. So, here's a short clip from one of my previous videos -

Hitler believes that when two animals of different species have an offspring, that offspring is inferior. So a donkey and a horse make a mule - which is infertile. Hitler says that this is nature's way of saying that diluted blood is wrong. Yes, it's pseudo-science that is not true at all, since tigers and lions can have ligers and they're not infertile, but you get the idea.

Hitler then applies this logic to humans and says that only pure-blooded Aryans can create nations. He says that in history, nations didn't rise and fall because of wars or economics, but because of their blood. Nations can only rise because of Aryans. And, in Hitler's mind, when an Aryan race creates a nation, they would conquer other races. They would then interbreed with their slaves, dilute their blood with the blood of the lesser-peoples they'd conquered, weaken themselves, and cause the downfall of their nation.

"A people that fails to preserve the purity of its racial blood thereby destroys the unity of the soul of the national in all its manifestations. A disintegrated national character is the inevitable consequence of a process of disintegration in the blood."⁶⁷

Okay, let's just stop there a second. A collective is a group of people. In this case it is a collective based on the people's skin colour, or race. In Marxism it is a collective based on

⁶⁷ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P307

someone's class. Which is why Lenin was happy to murder anyone who was born into the bourgeoisie class, and why Hitler was happy to murder anyone born Jewish.⁶⁸

The thing with Marxism is that, they think everyone is a member of their class - individuals don't exist, you're all part of your collective. If you go against your class, you are a 'class traitor' and can be killed. So, ideologically, everyone belongs to the group. Marxism embraces "socialized man" - the class collective.⁶⁹

Well, National Socialism attempts to do the same thing. It says that everyone is a member of their race - you're born into your racial collective, just like the Marxists think you're born into your class collective.⁷⁰

The problem with National Socialism though is that there's a little concept called "Social Darwinism". You may have heard of the idea of the "survival of the fittest". Well, that idea not only says that the fittest *race*, or *group*, will survive, but it also says that the fittest *individuals* will survive. Because, in order for the "race" to be fit, the fittest *individuals* need to survive and breed, passing their genes down from generation to generation.

So, while Marxism can reject the idea of the individual (and does so), racism *requires* the idea of the individual. And this is a *big* problem for collectivist ideologies like racism and National Socialism.

If I am an individual who is male, and another individual who is male commits a crime, I don't go to jail for it. Why? Because I'm an individual 'man' - I'm not 'men'. I'm not plural. Just because I'm male doesn't mean I'm guilty when *someone else* who's male does something stupid. Judge me - the individual - for who *I* am, not for what I'm not. Similarly, I have white skin, but if someone else who is white commits a crime, I didn't commit the crime. I'm not guilty just because I share the same skin colour, or the same eye colour, or the same hair colour. If someone who's a worker is lazy, that doesn't mean I'm lazy just because I'm a worker, right? And so on. Ultimately, if we're individuals, then what someone else does is not relevant. We're not guilty by association.

To be a socialist, or a collectivist, you need to join the collective. It requires that individuals give up their individuality and submit themselves to the group (the collective needs come first). If they don't do this, if you keep the idea of the individual, you can't have a collective. I'm an individual, not a plural - therefore there is no collective. So, to have socialism, they have to get rid of the idea of the individual. Well Marxism does just that. Marxism says that everyone is part of their class. And anyone who rejects their class, is a class traitor, and, so the logic goes, can be wiped out. There's no place for individuals in Marxism, and since class is a socially made-up concept that has no basis in reality, they can reject the idea of the individual and get away with it.

⁶⁸ Gellately, "Lenin, Stalin & Hitler," P60.

⁶⁹ Marx, & Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party." Marx, "Das Kapital V3," P593.

⁷⁰ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P198, P268-269, P324, P324 P555, P556.

But National Socialists and other racists *can't* ignore individuality because of 'Social Darwinism', which is *fundamental* to their racism, and to nature. They have to fit the individual into their collectivism, and this presents a fundamental issue because collectivism and individualism are polar opposite concepts.

If I'm an individual and I'm free to do individual things, then I haven't submitted to 'my' group. And that makes sense. And if I'm part of the group and submit myself to it, I'm no longer free to make individual choices. Effectively, I've lost my individuality. And that makes sense. However, if I'm part of the group, and that group is racial, then 'Social Darwinism' says I, as an individual, am competing against my group in order for the fittest individual to survive. Therefore, I'm still an individual, and the collective doesn't exist. If we're all part of the *race*, but we're competing against each other for survival of the fittest, then we're not all working towards the *race*. You see? If we're all individuals, and we're all competing against each other, then we're not working together for the collective - which would be socialism. So if we're individuals, which we are, socialism is impossible.

Here's how the flaw in their logic goes -

Hitler says the Germans are all 'supermen' because they all share this 'superior' Aryan blood. They all have to work towards the racial collective, cooperating together towards the whole. In such a society, the Aryans will have been socialized, hence 'socialism'.

But what about survival of the fittest? Doesn't that mean that, if a '*fit*' German wants to pass his superiority onto the next generation, he has to *outcompete* the other 'weaker' Germans? If so, the '*fit*' German has *outcompeted* the weaker German. Meaning, he is competing *against* 'the race', and against the 'racial community', rather than *cooperating* together towards the collective? Which means, they're not a collective working together at all, and thus, aren't 'socialized'.

And if Hitler insists that they are socialized and that they must not compete, then they're no longer individuals, and thus you cannot have survival of the fittest. And round it goes, in circular logic. So, the 'survival of the fittest' or 'Social-Darwinist' concept actually destroys the idea that there's some sort of 'collective race' that they're all supposed to be working towards, which is the central idea of National Socialism. It actually places a massive contradiction snap-bang in the middle of National Socialist ideology, and Hitler himself wasn't able to solve this.

"He was a socialist and deliberately so. But in his attachment to nature he was constantly able to observe the fight for existence, the struggle to defeat the other one, and to recognize this as a natural law."⁷¹

And this actually causes problems for the National Socialists of today. For example, Nazis like to say that there's a 'Jewish Banking Cartel' that's pulling the strings behind the scenes, which supposedly 'proves' that there's a Jewish plot to take over the world. Well, for

⁷¹ Wagener talking about Hitler, September 1930, from Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P223-224.

argument's sake, let's just go accept their premise for a second. If that is the case - if there is a bunch of Jewish bankers ruling the world, or being criminals or whatever - then why are all Jewish people to blame for the crimes of a few? Again, when one 'white' guy commits a crime, he is punished for the crime, and other 'white' guys are not punished for it. If I had a kid, and the kid runs someone over in their car, I don't get punished for it. It wasn't my fault - I didn't do it. So why should I get punished for it? That doesn't make any sense, right?

Similarly, if there's individuals owning an international banking cartel committing crimes, then surely we should just punish the individuals who are committing the crimes. We can't punish a new born baby for the crimes of an international banking cartel - the baby hasn't committed the crime. Even if the baby happens to be the kid of one of the bankers committing the crime - the baby is innocent. The baby, regardless of his race or whatever, is not to blame and doesn't deserve to be punished. And the reason why is because the baby is an individual, not a skin colour, and the baby isn't guilty by association for the crimes of other individuals.

So yes, if this 'international Jewish banking cartel' does actually exist, punish the individuals committing the crime, not the whole of the Jewish race. Can you imagine? In World War Two the Germans committed lots of crimes - so I guess, by the Nazis' own logic then, we have to blame every single German that has ever existed for the crimes that *some* Germans committed at a certain time. I mean, what kind of logic is that? Can you imagine if one guy from China commits a crime - therefore all 1.5 billion Chinese need to go to jail.

The same applies to the Marxists. One worker is lazy, therefore every worker is lazy. One woman smells, therefore by the collectivist-Feminist ideology, all women smell. No, it's stupid, childish logic which makes no sense. We're all individuals. So if there's one ugly duckling - only that duckling is ugly. All ducklings are not ugly.

So as you can see, this is the fundamental problem for the National Socialists - but also for other collectivist ideologies. If the National Socialists say that the 'Jews' have committed a crime, or if the Marxists say that the 'bourgeoisie' have committed a crime, the question needs to be - "what, you're saying that *all* of the Jews, including new born babies, are to blame? And you're saying *all* the bourgeoisie committed the crime, including the children, and that we should murder them all, including the innocent? Really?"

And if they say "no", then they're admitting that there's no reason to punish the entire class/racial/gender/nationality/whatever collective.

If they say "yes, they all committed the crime", then we can say "no they didn't, not *all* Jewish people are bankers, so they can't all be guilty". Because obviously, it's highly unlikely that every single Jewish person works in a bank. Similarly, I'm sure *some* factory bosses form cartels, or are racist, or are sexist or whatnot. Great. Punish those individuals that are at fault, not the millions of other people who happen to be associated with the individual who committed a crime.

Anyway, Hitler has a bit of a problem because of this contradiction. As a Racial Socialist, he wants to unite all the German race into a national collective - a People's State. But he has this 'survival of the fittest' concept to consider. And since individualism and collectivism are

polar opposite ideas, they don't go together properly and want to break apart. So basically what he does is, he takes his racial Socialism and slaps the concept of individualism on the side. Then uses bluetack, sticky-tape and string to keep the whole mess together, hoping it won't come apart. The result is a contradictory ideology with a fundamental flaw at the heart of it, which is why it doesn't look like Marxist Socialism.

"The racial Weltanschauung [world view] is fundamentally distinguished from the Marxist by reason of the fact that the former recognizes the significance of race and therefore also personal worth and has made these the pillars of its structure."⁷²

So National Socialism is both 'for the race' (collectivism), but also allows 'personal worth' (individualism).

"If the National Socialist Movement should fail to understand the fundamental importance of this essential principle, if it should merely varnish the external appearance of the present State and adopt the majority principle, it would really do nothing more than compete with Marxism on its own ground. For that reason it would not have the right to call itself a Weltanschauung. If the social programme of the movement consisted in eliminating personality and putting the multitude in its place, then National Socialism would be corrupted with the poison of Marxism, just as our national-bourgeois parties are."⁷³

Hitler is saying, if they forget about the individual, or the fact that they are racists (rather than class-ists), then they will be just like Marxist Socialists. Hitler literally spells that out. And now, hopefully, you can see why National Socialism is basically Marxism, but racist, and with the concept of the individual stuck on the side. Yes, it is different - but only slightly. And it's not capitalism just because it tries (and fails) to keep the idea of the individual; it's still Socialism. However, this slight difference in the ideology, of course, has some big implications for the way that the National Socialist economy turns out.

Part 2: The 'Jewish World Conspiracy'

Now that we understand that Hitler's ideology is calling for a racial-collective, but has individualism stuck on the side, it's important to understand how this warps Hitler's view of economics, and of history. But it also explains why he hates Jewish people.

In Hitler's mind, nations are created only by Aryan races. And the individuals of the Aryan race work together for the betterment of their racial community. He says that, when a 'superior' race mixes its blood with that of an 'inferior' race, the blood gets weak, and the nation falls as a result - since only pure blooded people can create nations (in his mind). And, if there are no Aryans left, then, by this logic, civilisation will end.⁷⁴

⁷² Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P406

⁷³ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P406-407.

⁷⁴ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P257-259, 267-269, 290-291.

"The greatness of the Aryan is not based on his intellectual powers, but rather on his willingness to devote all his faculties to the service of the community..."⁷⁵

"The Jew offers the most striking contrast to the Aryan. There is probably no other people in the world who have so developed the instinct of self-preservation as the so-called 'chosen' people'."⁷⁶

"With the Jewish people the readiness for sacrifice does not extend beyond the simple instinct of individual preservation... Jews act in concord only when a common danger threatens them or a common prey attracts them. Where these two motives no longer exist then the most brutal egotism appears and these people who before had lived together in unity will turn into a swarm of rats that bitterly fight against each other."⁷⁷

So notice, Hitler's saying that Jewish people are entirely individualistic, and thus do not work for the betterment of their community. They're *not* capable of creating a racial collective like the Aryan races are, and thus they are entirely capitalistic, and cannot create civilisations.

"Since the Jew... never had a civilization of his own, he has always been furnished by others..."⁷⁸

"That is why the Jewish people... have not a culture - certainly not a culture of their own. The culture which the Jew enjoys to-day is the product of the work of others and this product is debased in the hands of the Jew."⁷⁹

"If the Jews were the only people in the world they would be wallowing in filth and mire and would exploit one another and try to exterminate one another in a bitter struggle, except in so far as their utter lack of the ideal of sacrifice, which shows itself in their cowardly spirit, would prevent this struggle from developing."⁸⁰

The caricature of Capitalism (to those who do not understand it) is to think it is purely about individuals competing against each other for greed and profit. Well in Hitler's mind, the 'Jews' are supposedly out for themselves like that. So he thinks the Jews are Capitalism and Capitalism is the Jews. So, when people argue that 'Hitler is a Capitalist', not only are they completely wrong and do not understand Hitler's own ideology, but they are literally saying that "National Socialism is Jewish". And then they wonder why their arguments don't work.

But, to understand National Socialist ideology even further, what Hitler goes on to say is that the Jews are aiming to destroy civilization. He says -

⁷⁵ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P269.

⁷⁶ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P271-272.

⁷⁷ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P273.

⁷⁸ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P272-273.

⁷⁹ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P274.

⁸⁰ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P273.

"Jewish self-expansion is a parasitic phenomenon--since the Jew is always looking for new pastures for his race."⁸¹

"The Jew wriggles his way in among the body of the nations and bores them hollow from inside. The weapons with which he works are lies and calumny, poisonous infection and disintegration, until he has ruined his hated adversary."⁸²

"The religious teaching of the Jews is principally a collection of instructions for maintaining the Jewish blood pure and for regulating intercourse between Jews and the rest of the world: that is to say, their relation with non-Jews."⁸³

"History furnishes us with innumerable instances that prove this law. It shows, with a startling clarity, that whenever Aryans have mingled their blood with that of an inferior race the result has been the downfall of the people who were the standard-bearers of a higher culture."⁸⁴

"A people that fails to preserve the purity of its racial blood thereby destroys the unity of the soul of the national in all its manifestations. A disintegrated national character is the inevitable consequence of a process of disintegration in the blood."⁸⁵

Right, so Hitler is making it clear that, in his mind, the Jews are aiming to infiltrate the nations of the world, then interbreed with the Aryans, poison the 'blood', and (since nations cannot exist without Aryan blood, apparently) this will cause the end of civilisation. Everyone will end up Jewish, and thus no nations can exist, since the Jews aren't Aryans and can't create nations. This is why, in a previous video, I jokingly sang a song saying "Hitler thought he was trying to save the world". But joking aside, in his mind, Hitler genuinely thinks that he is trying to save the world. That's not a joke - he actually thinks this.

But Hitler goes even further. He says that industrialization and 'Jewish capitalism' have caused a 'crisis' for the modern world.⁸⁶

"...the Jew seized upon the manifold possibilities which the situation offered him for the future. While on the one hand he organized capitalistic methods of exploitation to their ultimate degree of efficiency, he curried favour with the victims of this policy and his power and in a short while became the leader of their struggle against himself."⁸⁷

And there you go. Hitler is saying that the Jews are using capitalism to bring about a social-economic crisis. And this is all a cunning plan, because the Jews are using this crisis to gain support from the victims of this crisis - the poor workers. And they, in-turn, will call for Marxist-Socialism, which is actually what the Jews really want.

⁸¹ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P276.

⁸² Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P590.

⁸³ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P278.

⁸⁴ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P259.

⁸⁵ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P307.

⁸⁶ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P288-289.

⁸⁷ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P289.

"Just as he succeeded in obtaining civic rights by intrigues carried on under the protection of the bourgeois class, he now hoped that by joining in the struggle which the workers were waging for their own existence he would be able to obtain full control over them."⁸⁸

"When that moment arrives, then the only objective the workers will have to fight for will be the future of the Jewish people. Without knowing it, the worker is placing himself at the service of the very power against which he believes he is fighting."⁸⁹

"This Marxist doctrine is an individual mixture of human reason and human absurdity; but the combination is arranged in such a way that only the absurd part of it could ever be put into practice, but never the reasonable part of it. By categorically repudiating the personal worth of the individual and also the nation and its racial constituent, this doctrine destroys the fundamental basis of all civilization; for civilization essentially depends on these very factors. Such is the true essence of the Marxist Weltanschauung [world view], so far as the word Weltanschauung can be applied at all to this phantom arising from a criminal brain. The destruction of the concept of personality and of race removes the chief obstacle which barred the way to domination of the social body by its inferior elements, which are the Jews."⁹⁰

Yes, so 'Jewish capitalism' (in Hitler's mind) is causing a crisis that 'Jewish communism' is using to seize control of the world. And since communism destroys the idea of 'race' and individuals, this will allow the Jews to breed with the Aryan race and bring the downfall of civilization (supposedly). So, when in the past I've shown the political spectrum from the point of view of Hitler and the National Socialist, you have Jewish capitalism on the Right, and Jewish Bolshevism on the Left. And Hitler puts himself in the middle - a 'Nazi Third Way'. (There is a 'Fascist Third Way' but the Fascists didn't believe in the Jewish world conspiracy like the Nazis do, so they're a separate entity, but you can see why people think they're the same thing - because they're closely aligned. Anyway -) Hitler is actually fighting against both Marxism *and* Capitalism, and the doctrine he's using to fight these 'evil' forces is Socialism - a racial-Socialism.

"The internationalization of our German economic system, that is to say, the transference of our productive forces to the control of Jewish international finance, can be completely carried out only in a State that has been politically Bolshevikized. But the Marxist fighting forces, commanded by international and Jewish stock-exchange capital, cannot finally smash the national resistance in Germany without friendly help from outside."⁹¹

⁸⁸ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P290.

⁸⁹ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P290.

⁹⁰ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P290-291.

⁹¹ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P555.

"Hence it is that at the present time the Jew is the great agitator for the complete destruction of Germany."⁹²

"The Jewish way of reasoning thus becomes quite clear. The Bolshevization of Germany, that is to say, the extermination of the patriotic and national German intellectuals, thus making it possible to force German Labour to bear the yoke of international Jewish finance - that is only the overture to the movement for expanding Jewish power on a wider scale and finally subjugating the world to its rule."⁹³

So, there you go. We can see that Hitler and National Socialism are fighting against the Jews, who are using both capitalism and Marxism to destroy the world. In Hitler's mind, Marxism is being controlled by "international Jewish finance". In other words, Marxism is controlled by capitalism, which is controlled by the Jews. This is why he dislikes both Marxism and capitalism, and the Jews. Thus, in Hitler's mind, he thinks he's trying to save the world.

"Contrary to the accepted Marxist interpretation, Hitler was not an opponent of Marxism and did not want to destroy it because he was 'inimical to labour' but because he was caught up in the insane idea that Marxism was an instrument of the Jews for the achievement of world domination, and above all because he rejected internationalism, 'pacifism' and the negation of the 'personality principle' by Marxism."

⁹⁴

Part 3: Hitler Fights 'Jewish Capital'

In 1928, Hitler wondered if Jewish-Marxism (funded by Jewish-capitalism) would be overthrown in the Soviet Union.

"However, it is conceivable that in Russia itself an inner change within the Bolshevik world could take place insofar as the Jewish element could perhaps be forced aside by a more or less Russian national one. Then it could also not be excluded that the present real Jewish-capitalist-Bolshevik Russia could be driven to national-anti-capitalist tendencies."⁹⁵

He concludes that this would be unlikely. So how does he intend to fight the Jewish capitalist-Marxist conspiracy?

"For a fight it will have to be, since the first objective will not be to build up the idea of the People's State but rather to wipe out the Jewish State which is now in existence. As so often happens in the course of history, the main difficulty is not to establish a new order of things but to clear the ground for its establishment."⁹⁶

⁹² Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P555.

⁹³ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P556.

⁹⁴ Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P137-138.

⁹⁵ Hitler, "Second Book," P120. Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P427.

⁹⁶ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P410.

Hitler will fight the Jews, *then* bring in a socialist "People's State". To fight both 'Jewish-Capitalism' and 'Jewish-international-Marxism', Hitler will forge his own Nationalistic version of Socialism.

"The nationalization of the masses can be successfully achieved only if, in the positive struggle to win the soul of the people, those who spread the international poison among them are exterminated."⁹⁷

Hitler is saying here that he's going to exterminate the 'international poison' - meaning, the Jews. And, once he's done that, he's going to bring about the 'nationalization of the masses'. In other words, the collectivisation of the race. He's going to 'socialize the people' - create a 'People's State' for the German race.

"I am a German nationalist. This means that I proclaim my nationality. My whole thought and action belongs to it. I am a socialist. I see no class and no social estate before me, but that community of the Folk, made up of people who are linked by blood, united by a language, and subject to a same general fate..."⁹⁸

"The National Socialist Movement which I lead today views its goal as the liberation of our Folk within and without."⁹⁹

Hitler's also going to unite the German people and go East, in order to get Living Space and the resources he needs to create his National Socialist utopia. This also serves the purpose of destroying the Marxist Soviet Union, which he believes is run by Jewish-capital.¹⁰⁰

So when the Marxists claim that Hitler's not a Socialist, they're wrong because he's fighting Marxism (which he thinks is Jewish) in order to found a true Socialist collective for Aryans. And when they claim that Hitler is a capitalist, they're also wrong because he's fighting against Capitalism, which he sees as Jewish. Thus, Hitler is a Socialist. He's just not a Marxist-Socialist. He wants a racial National Socialism.

Part 4: Racial-Socialism

Both National Socialism and Marxist Socialism are discriminatory ideologies. If you were born into the bourgeoisie, the Marxists of Lenin's regime would view you as inherently bourgeois. Your class would always be with you; a stigma you were born with and could never erase. Once a bourgeoisie, always a bourgeoisie. Marxism promises a classless society, but in reality, the only reason it's classless is because all the bourgeoisie would have been murdered or enslaved. Well, the same thing applies to Hitler's racial-version of Socialism; all Germans are equal, and those who were not born German bare the stigma of their race.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P307.

⁹⁸ Hitler, "Second Book," P50.

⁹⁹ Hitler, "Second Book," P51.

¹⁰⁰ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P573-608. Hitler, "Second Book," P51-52.

¹⁰¹ Gellately, "Lenin, Stalin and Hitler," P60.

"The Nazis' racist teachings have been read solely as encouragement for hatred, violence, and murder, but for millions of Germans their appeal lay in the promise of real equality within the ethnic community. Externally, Nazi ideology emphasized differences; internally, it smoothed them over."¹⁰²

"For all those who legally belonged to the German racial community - about 95 percent of the population - social divides became ever smaller."¹⁰³

Lenin called for the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. Hitler called for the 'dictatorship of the Aryan' - or a "People's State".¹⁰⁴ For Lenin, the bourgeoisie must be removed from society. For Hitler, the Jews must be removed from society.¹⁰⁵ So this isn't class-Socialism, which is what Marxism preaches. National Socialism is a racial-Socialism, and manifests itself slightly differently to Marxism. In fact, Hitler wanted to cure the class crisis of Marxism by removing the Jews, who he thought were causing it for their own ends.¹⁰⁶

In their counterarguments against me, Marxists have said that, because I made up the term 'racial-Socialism', this is proof that I am willing to make stuff up, therefore I cannot be trusted. No, the term 'racial-Socialism' describes National Socialism perfectly. In fact, it's better than saying 'National Socialism' since Hitler needed to destroy and conquer several nations in order to unite the German people under one nation. Therefore, his end-goal was a nationalism, but his policy was inherently 'international' in nature. Same goes with Lenin and the Bolsheviks. They were 'international' because they wanted to unite the workers in every country, but their end-goal was 'nationalism', since if they united the workers of the world under one State, that State would be a nation. A nation can be the size of a city, or encompass the world. There's no rule that says a nation is not a nation just because it's the only nation in existence. Uniting the world under one nation would be a nation. 'One nation, under God.' So Marxism is national and international in nature. Well, so is German National Socialism.

The main difference between these two ideologies is not the nationalism and internationalism (which are two sides of the same coin), but their theories of class and race. Marxism is class-socialism, since it believes in the Class Theory of History, and hopes to unite the workers of the world under one nation. National Socialism is racial-socialism, since it believes in the Racial Theory of History, and hopes to unite the Germans of the world under one nation.

"The more fanatically nationalist we are, the more we must take the welfare of the national community to heart, that means the more fanatically socialist we become."¹⁰⁷

¹⁰² Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P30.

¹⁰³ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P30.

¹⁰⁴ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P399.

¹⁰⁵ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P307-308.

¹⁰⁶ Hitler, "Mein Kampf," P308-309.

¹⁰⁷ Hitler speech 29 Jan 1923, from Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P411.

"...socialism becomes nationalism, nationalism socialism. They are both one, socialism and nationalism. They are the greatest fighters for their own people..."¹⁰⁸

Thus, the term 'racial-Socialism' does a decent job of describing the ideology in question. It simplifies the concept and puts it in plain language that's easy to understand for most people. The term 'class-socialism' does the same for Marxism. And this frees up the term 'nationality socialism' to best describe Fascism, since Fascists aren't always racist, and there were plenty of Jewish members of the Fascist Party in Italy.

"...the Fascists were not racist - necessarily. Mussolini believed, for example, that race was not a biological phenomenon but a spiritual one... A Jew could certainly be an Italian. Many of the most committed Fascists were Jews... Given Italy's rich racial mix, Nazi style racism would have been quite impossible in Italy anyway. The Fascists did not advocate the extermination of Jews. The Nazis did."¹⁰⁹

So, creating terms to describe historical concepts is not me 'making stuff up'. Hans Mommsen created the term 'cumulative radicalization' to describe the evolution of Nazi atrocities over time. Yet, I don't hear many Marxists complaining that Hans Mommsen is making things up.

The reality is that the Marxist counterargument that says I've invented a term, thus this is proof that I'm making stuff up, is shallow at best. It's a tactic designed to smear and slander enemies of their world view, their Weltanschauung, much like many of their other counterarguments. If I want to design a term to best describe a historical ideology or process, I'm free to do so, and this does not go against the theory of history.

Part 5: Totalitarianism

If Hitler was a capitalist - if National Socialism was just capitalism in disguise - then Hitler was not totalitarian. You cannot have totalitarianism without total-state control of the economy. Since the idea of totalitarianism was invented by Mussolini and the Fascists in 1925 to describe their own regime.¹¹⁰

"...everything in the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state..."¹¹¹

Therefore, it's worth pointing out that, to be classed as totalitarian, both Fascism and National Socialism must be Socialist. So, those arguing that it is capitalism, are basically saying that Hitler and Mussolini did not have totalitarian control over their nations. Which is incorrect, but that's what they argue. The only thing is, if they weren't totalitarian, then that means that the only totalitarian regimes we've ever seen in history have all been Marxist in nature. Why does Marxism always result in totalitarianism? I wonder.

¹⁰⁸ Hitler speech 6 March 1927, from Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P411.

¹⁰⁹ Farrell, "Mussolini," Chapter 11.

¹¹⁰ Farrell, "Mussolini," Chapter 10.

¹¹¹ Mussolini, speech in Milan, 28 October 1925.

Of course, the Marxist totalitarian socialist paradise aside, the ideologies of both National Socialism and Fascism were totalitarian in nature.

"Fascism's big idea was the corporate state - the so-called Third Way between Capitalism and Communism - which would abolish the class war. Both Capitalism and Communism meant class war. In the class war, Capitalism, via the free market, gave the bosses the upper hand, and Communism, via the state, the masses. Fascism, via the corporate state, would incorporate both bosses and masses inside the state and so abolish class war."¹¹²

I'm not going to dwell on Fascism here, since that's a different ideology. But we have seen, and will continue to see, throughout this video that there's plenty of indication that the Nazis were totalitarian in nature. They also boasted about it -

"...our party has always aspired to the totalitarian state... The goal of the revolution must be a totalitarian state pervading all of public life."¹¹³

It was the doctrine of totalitarianism which inspired the Nazi 'Gleichschaltung', or 'synchronization', of the state from the top-down.¹¹⁴ And this is related to the historiographical debate that raged throughout the 1970s and 80s, which I covered in another video and studied at college, about whether Hitler was a 'strong' or 'weak' dictator.¹¹⁵ The current consensus is that Hitler guided the state and gave it direction, and the state carried out his instructions, but also had the freedom to do its own thing.¹¹⁶ So, the state must have had control over the economy, otherwise it couldn't have done what it did, and, even talking about Hitler would be pointless since his state had no control over what was happening in the event it was capitalism.

Well, that way of looking at the Third Reich and World War Two just doesn't match reality. Hitler's regime monopolized power. And in the next section, we're going to look at the nature of the Nazi economy, and see just how totalitarian it really was. However, it would not be right to call Hitler a totalitarian unless he had total control over the economy. It's 'everything in the state', not 'everything in the state... except for the economy'.

But if the regime was capitalist, then the regime did not have total power. Hitler would not be totalitarian. Nor would the German people have to have obeyed his every command, since he would not have had total power. There would have been no secret police, or guiding ideology, or mass propaganda, or volksgemeinschaft, or anything like that. Our view on Fascism would also have to change, and I think it would become impossible to actually explain anything relating to the Nazi or Fascist economies or how World War Two even

¹¹² Farrell, "Mussolini," Chapter 10.

¹¹³ Goebbels, from Neumann, "Behemoth," P48.

¹¹⁴ Neumann, "Behemoth," P51.

¹¹⁵ TIK, "Was Hitler a Strong or Weak Dictator? Intentionalist vs Functionalist/Structuralist Debate"
<https://youtu.be/U8LNfjFyGU8>

¹¹⁶ Kershaw, "Stalinism and Nazism," P91-106.

began, if this wasn't totalitarianism... which is perhaps why the Marxists can't explain it, since they don't recognize any of this.

I will leave it up to the individual viewer to decide if Hitler was either a socialist and a totalitarian, or a capitalist and not a totalitarian. But I maintain that Hitler was a socialist and thus also totalitarian. And the evidence I'm about to present should hopefully explain why I think that.

Section 6: The Nazi Economy

Part 1: 'Privatization'

(If you've skipped to this part of the video, you definitely need to go back to the previous part first, on the ideology of National Socialism, in order to understand this part of the video.)

As the previous section made clear, Hitler wanted to destroy the Jewish State first, and needed to conquer Living Space, *before* he implemented full-Socialism. There's also a fundamental contradiction within National Socialist ideology, where the 'race' and the 'individual' are at odds with one another.

So, assuming you understand these principles, it might now start to make sense to you as to why Hitler's Socialist economy doesn't quite look like the Marxist-Bolshevik economy of the Soviet Union. Hitler rejects both capitalism and Marxism, seeing them both as being Jewish. Instead, he wants to create a racial-socialism - an Aryan racial state's control of the economy - but he also wants there to be competition within that. And since he doesn't have the resources to implement full-Socialism, he's calling for a limited-Socialism until after the conquest of Russia. This is why Hitler's state allows *some* individual competition and *some* 'survival of the fittest' mentality in the economy. But he also can't allow *full capitalism*, where every German is out for himself and not working towards his 'race', because then he wouldn't be working to "wipe out the Jewish State" (to use his own language) in preparation for the racial-social collective he wants to create.

(Again, go back to the previous section if you skipped to this part, or you don't understand what I've just said, and really try to understand it.)

But yes, this is why we see Nazi Party officials walking into the factories and taking them over from within (dictating policies to the owners, as described in Günter Reiman's '*The Vampire Economy*', and Tooke's '*Wages of Destruction*' to name a few), *and* the nationalization of industries - like Junker's factory¹¹⁷ - *but also* the selling of those industries back to individuals in the Nazi Party, who can then run the business, sell products, and make a profit.¹¹⁸ That profit, as Point 14 of the Nazi 'Twenty-Five Points', declared in 1920, shall be shared out among the community.¹¹⁹

This is why the Germans could own property, and the Jews see their property taken from them, even though the National Socialists abolished private property in 1933, not long after taking power.

¹¹⁷ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," Chapter 2 (no page numbers on Kindle). Temin, "Soviet and Nazi Economic Planning in the 1930s," P576-577. Tooke, "Wages of Destruction," P111-113.

¹¹⁸ Bel, G. "Against the mainstream: Nazi privatization in 1930s Germany," Universitat de Barcelona, PDF.

¹¹⁹ Feder, G. "The Programe of the NSDAP: The National Socialist German Workers' Party and its General Conceptions." RJJ Enterprises LTD, P32.

28 February 1933 -

Order of the Reich President for the Protection of People and State

On the basis of Article 48 paragraph 2 of the Constitution of the German Reich, the following is ordered in defense against Communist state-endangering acts of violence:

§ 1. Articles 114, 115, 117, 118, 123, 124 and 153 of the Constitution of the German Reich are suspended until further notice. It is therefore permissible to restrict the rights of personal freedom [habeas corpus], freedom of (opinion) expression, including the freedom of the press, the freedom to organize and assemble, the privacy of postal, telegraphic and telephonic communications. Warrants for House searches, orders for confiscations as well as restrictions on property, are also permissible beyond the legal limits otherwise prescribed.”¹²⁰

Here's two of the articles of the Weimar Constitution relating to property rights that were scrapped by the decree.

Article 115.

The dwelling of every German is his sanctuary and is inviolable. Exceptions may be imposed only by authority of law.

This is scrapped. Your home is no longer yours, if the State decides to take it from you.

Article 153.

Property shall be guaranteed by the constitution. Its nature and limits shall be prescribed by law.

Expropriation [which is - noun, the action by the state or an authority of taking property from its owner for public use or benefit.] shall take place only for the general good and only on the basis of law. It shall be accompanied by payment of just compensation unless otherwise provided by national law. In case of dispute over the amount of compensation recourse to the ordinary courts shall be permitted, unless otherwise provided by national law. Expropriation by the Reich over against the states, municipalities, and associations serving the public welfare may take place only upon the payment of compensation.

Property imposes obligations. Its use by its owner shall at the same time serve the public good.¹²¹

This was also scrapped. The State could now steal your property off you, and didn't have to compensate you. So, by law, private property rights no longer existed. Individuals couldn't

¹²⁰ Text of the Reichstag Fire Decree, 28 Feb 1933.

¹²¹ Text of the Weimar Constitution.

own property, since all property could at any time be seized by the state. In effect, without property rights, all property belonged to the State, and the German people were effectively 'leased' it by the State until it was taken off them. This is why the Reichstag Fire Decree is actually one of the first acts against the Jews - because it stripped them of their property rights, which meant that, they could have their property seized, which the Nazis later took off them.

The Germans on the other hand were allowed to keep their property because that suited Hitler and the National Socialist State's ideology, but non-Germans, or Germans who weren't obeying the State, could have their property or businesses stolen from them.

"The Nazis viewed private property as conditional on its use - not as a fundamental right. If the property was not being used to further Nazi goals, it could be nationalized."¹²²

"Prof. Junkers of the Junkers aeroplane factory refused to follow the government's bidding in 1934. The Nazis thereupon took over the plant, compensating Junkers for his loss. This was the context in which other contracts were negotiated."¹²³

"Manufacturers in Germany were panic-stricken when they heard of the experiences of some industrialists who were more or less expropriated [had their property seized] by the State. These industrialists were visited by State auditors who had strict orders to "examine" the balance sheets and all bookkeeping entries of the company (or individual businessman) for the preceding two, three, or more years until some error or false entry was found. The slightest formal mistake was punished with tremendous penalties. A fine of millions of marks was imposed for a single bookkeeping error. Obviously, the examination of the books was simply a pretext for partial expropriation of the private capitalist with a view to complete expropriation and seizure of the desired property later. The owner of the property was helpless, since under fascism [it's actually National Socialism, not Fascism] there is no longer an independent judiciary that protects the property rights of private citizens against the state. The authoritarian State has made it a principle that private property is no longer sacred."

¹²⁴

This view is backed up by another contemporary source, written in the 1940s by Neumann.

"In theory, the state has unlimited power. It could legally do almost anything; it could expropriate anybody."¹²⁵

(Of course, he then calls this socialism "state-capitalism", but we've already been over that.)

¹²² Temin, "Soviet and Nazi Economic Planning in the 1930s," P576.

¹²³ Temin, "Soviet and Nazi Economic Planning in the 1930s," P576-577.

¹²⁴ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," Chapter 2 (no page number, as on Kindle).

¹²⁵ Neumann, "Behemoth," P254.

Reimann, in 1939, quotes from a German businessman's letter to an American businessman

"The difference between this and the Russian system is much less than you think, despite the fact that officially we are still independent businessmen." "Some businessmen have even started studying Marxist theories, so that they will have a better understanding of the present economic system." "How can we possibly manage a firm according to business principles if it is impossible to make any predictions as to the prices at which goods are to be bought and sold? We are completely dependent on arbitrary Government decisions concerning quantity, quality and prices for foreign raw materials." "You cannot imagine how taxation has increased. Yet everyone is afraid to complain about it. The new State loans are nothing but confiscation of private property, because no one believed that the Government will ever make repayment, nor even pay interest after the first few years." "We businessmen still make sufficient profit, sometimes even large profits, but we never know how much we are going to be able to keep..."¹²⁶

"The decree of February 28, 1933, nullified article 153 of the Weimar Constitution which guaranteed private property and restricted interference with private property in accordance with certain legally defined conditions ... The conception of property has experienced a fundamental change. The individualistic conception of the State - a result of the liberal spirit - must give way to the concept that communal welfare precedes individual welfare. (Gemeinnutz geht vor Eigennutz)."¹²⁷

[Meaning: the common good comes before the self.]

"There exists no law which binds the State. The State can do what it regards as necessary, because it has the authority." "The next stage of National-Socialist economic policy consists of replacing capitalist laws by policy."¹²⁸

"The life of the German businessman is full of contradictions. He cordially dislikes the gigantic, top-heavy, bureaucratic State machine which is strangling his economic independence. Yet he needs the aid of these despised bureaucrats more and more, and is forced to run after them, begging for concessions, privileges, grants, in fear that his competitor will gain the advantage."¹²⁹

"Such a system also changes the psychology of businessmen. Their experiences teach them that the old right of property no longer exists. They find themselves compelled to respect the "national interest" or the "welfare of the community."

"Businessmen must claim that everything they do, any new business for which they

¹²⁶ German businessman to American businessman, from Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," (no page number on Kindle).

¹²⁷ Jahrbuch des Oeffentlichen Rechtes der Gegenwart, ed. by Otto Koellreuther (1935), p. 267. - Quoted from Reimann, "The Vampire Economy".

¹²⁸ Fritz Nonnenbruch, the financial editor of the Voelkischer Beobachter. Quoted from Reimann, "The Vampire Economy."

¹²⁹ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," (no page number on Kindle).

want a certificate, any preferment in the supply of raw materials, etc., is "in the interest of the national community."¹³⁰

The Nazi policy of "Gleichschaltung" was the idea of bringing-into line all of Germany into National Socialism. This was going on throughout the 1930s. Funny how we have two completely opposite concepts - the privatization of industry, at the same time as the bringing-into line of all industry. Isn't that a contradiction? Well, the reason why is because, as several people have pointed out, the term "privatization" wasn't invented by the Nazis themselves, but was invented by foreigners looking in. The actual term the Nazis used was "Gleichschaltung", which was the process of bringing-into-line all of Germany. That was not 'privatization' in the sense used by the opponents of the idea that National Socialism was Socialism.

In reality, the Nazis nationalized industries that didn't do as they insisted, then 're-privatized' them. But 're-privatization' was not the correct term, since those businesses could only function as part of the state, and were under control by the state, and weren't really owned by their owners. This is why they centralized most businesses into 13 corporations. Yes, at first glance, it looks like the '*rich bourgeois industrialists*' are in charge, but the reality is that it's easier for Hitler and his party to control 13 corporations than thousands of smaller businesses, and it still allows them to compete with each other for his favour.¹³¹

"Both governments [Nazi and Soviet] reorganized industry into larger units, ostensibly to increase state control over economic activity [which is socialism]. The Nazis reorganized industry into 13 administrative groups with a large number of subgroups to create a private hierarchy for state control. [You can't actually have a 'private' hierarchy - that's a contradiction in terms. Hierarchies are 'public', which is why corporations are known as 'public' corporations. But anyway -] The state therefore could direct the firms' activities without acquiring direct ownership of enterprises. The pre-existing tendency to form cartels was encouraged to eliminate competition that would destabilize prices."¹³²

In fact, cartels were actually made compulsory by the Nazi state to allow the state to control the economy.¹³³

"Cartels have indeed become of the organs for attaining full employment with the collaboration and under the pressure of the state."¹³⁴

"The Soviets had made a similar move in the 1920s. Faced with a scarcity of administrative personnel, the state encouraged enterprises to combine into trusts and trusts to combine into syndicates."¹³⁵

¹³⁰ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," (no page number on Kindle).

¹³¹ Temin, "Soviet and Nazi Economic Planning in the 1930s," P582-583, P590-591.

¹³² Temin, "Soviet and Nazi Economic Planning in the 1930s," P582-583.

¹³³ Neumann, "Behemoth," P265-268.

¹³⁴ Neumann, "Behemoth," P270.

¹³⁵ Temin, "Soviet and Nazi Economic Planning in the 1930s," P583.

I just want to point out with that, corporations are syndicates - they're the same thing. It's just the Fascists called their syndicates 'corporations', which was a term they invented. There is no difference. The Soviet Union had corporations, but they called them 'syndicates'. But anyway, after having formed their syndicates -

"These large units continued into the 1930s where they were utilized to bridge the gap between overall plans and actual production."¹³⁶

So again, this was a tool used by the state on the road to serfdom - I mean, Socialism.

"... this difference was not important to many decisions. The incentives for managers - both positive and negative - were very similar in the two countries. Consequently, their responses to the [Four or Five Year] plans were also similar. In neither case did the managers set the goals of the plans."¹³⁷

Schacht centralized and heavily regulated the electricity production industry, which then sparked a new plan of economic administration. This was all in 1935.¹³⁸

"...in practice the Reichsbank and the Reich Ministry of Economic Affairs had no intention of allowing the radical activists of the SA, the shopfloor militants of the Nazi party or Gauleiter commissioners to dictate the course of events. Under the slogan of the 'strong state', the ministerial bureaucracy fashioned a new national structure of economic regulation."¹³⁹

Schacht was in charge of the Reichsbank in the 1930s when the Nazis took power. It was this Central Public Sector State Bank - in other words, the socialist bank (which is why Marx called for central banks in the Communist Manifesto) - which controlled the currency supply which financed the rearmament program, the Nazi welfare state, and many other programs too.

"We worked and governed with incredible elan. We really ruled. For the bureaucrats of the Ministry the contrast to the Weimar Republic was stark. Party chatter in the Reichstag was no longer heard. The language of the bureaucracy was rid of the paralysing formula: technically right but politically impossible."¹⁴⁰

"It would be absurd to deny the reality of this shift. The crisis of corporate capitalism in the course of the Great Depression did permanently alter the balance of power. Never again was big business to influence the course of government in Germany as directly as it did between the outbreak of World War I in 1914 and the onset of the

¹³⁶ Temin, "Soviet and Nazi Economic Planning in the 1930s," P583.

¹³⁷ Temin, "Soviet and Nazi Economic Planning in the 1930s," P590-591.

¹³⁸ Tooze, "Wages of Destruction," P111-112.

¹³⁹ Tooze, "Wages of Destruction," P112.

¹⁴⁰ Schacht, speaking of the situation after 1933, quoted from Tooze, "Wages of Destruction," P112-113.

Depression in 1929. The Reich's economic administration, for its part, accumulated unprecedented powers of national economic control."¹⁴¹

And yet Tooze somehow concludes that it was capitalism... which just doesn't make any sense.

Ultimately, so long as Hitler was in *control* of the economy and could guide the national social group towards whatever goal he set for it, he was willing to let individuals run things on his behalf. If those individuals were getting in the way, or weren't playing ball, he would seize their property or business, get rid of them, and put someone in charge who would do as he wanted. Hitler still had control of the economy. He still had socialism. It wasn't *full* ownership by the state, but it didn't need to be. He - the state - was in control of it. He could finance the army using the state central bank, he could coerce the industrialists to do his bidding, he could seize property whenever he wanted. This is socialism.

Yes, critics have said that the Nazis 'privatized' the industries, and said that the term 'privatization' was invented in this era to describe the Nazi policy. Such critics bring up *one* source which, supposedly, backs up their argument and "refutes" mine - Bel's "Against the Mainstream: Nazi Privatization in 1930s Germany."

First off, the use of one secondary source in isolation is not sufficient. I have used multiple sources here which directly go against what Bel said in his article. So straight away, we have a problem. Secondly, it's clear that the people using this source have not read it closely. Sure, the title does say the word 'privatization', and the author is pushing towards the idea that there was privatization in Nazi Germany. However, upon closer inspection, the argument he presents begins to unravel itself. For starters, in the 'abstract' section right at the beginning, he makes clear:

"Privatization was part of an intentional policy with multiple objectives and was not ideologically driven."¹⁴²

"In addition, privatization was used as a political tool to enhance support for the government and for the Nazi Party."¹⁴³

That's right, even in the event that this was 'privatization', it was not done because National Socialism was capitalism. It was used as a political tool and so, this doesn't prove that Hitler was a capitalist. So, even in the best case scenario, this source doesn't support the idea that National Socialism was capitalism at all.

"None of the contemporary economic analyses of privatization take into account an important, earlier case: the privatization policy implemented by the National Socialist (Nazi) Party in Germany."¹⁴⁴

¹⁴¹ Tooze, "Wages of Destruction," P113.

¹⁴² Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P2.

¹⁴³ Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P2.

¹⁴⁴ Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P3.

Hmmm... I wonder why they wouldn't mention this? Why would you miss out what was, supposedly the 'first' privatization effort? That doesn't make any sense.

"It is a fact that the government of the Nazi Party sold off public ownership in several Stateowned firms in the mid-1930s. These firms belonged to a wide range of sectors: steel, mining, banking, local public utilities, shipyards, ship-lines, railways, etc."¹⁴⁵

Okay, a pretty solid statement.

"In addition, the delivery of some public services that were produced by government prior to the 1930s, especially social and labor-related services, was transferred to the private sector, mainly to organizations within the party."¹⁴⁶

...was transferred to the *private* sector... mainly to *organizations*... *within*... the *Nazi party*. Transferred to the '*private*' sector, to the party. Transferred to the private state-party.

Hold on, hold on. Bel thinks that the Nazi Party - the State - was a private-sector organization? Are you for real? And this isn't the only time Bel says this either.

"Besides the transfer to the private sector of public ownership in firms, the Nazi government also transferred many public services (some long established, others newly created) to special organizations: either the Nazi party and its affiliates or other allegedly independent organizations which were set up for a specific purpose..."¹⁴⁷

Okay so, now I'm beginning to question whether anything in this article can be taken at face value. If you don't know that the Nazi Party was the State, if you don't realize that many of the people that 'bought' the firms that are listed in this piece were actually members of the Nazi Party, or had been restricted by laws and regulations and taxes to prevent them from operating privately, then it's hard to trust whatever is being said by this author.

"Die Deutsche Arbeitsfront (German Labor Front) was not part of the machinery of the State, but a legally independent organization of the Nazi Party..."¹⁴⁸

Are you for real? The Nazi Party is the State. Also, it's not private if you're *forced* to join it, since you - the private citizen - can't make a *private* decision, since the *public*-sector is making that decision for you, *forcing* you to join their organizations. If you can't make a private decision, then you are not free, if you are not free, you are a slave. This is why, in socialism, you are a slave of the public sector state.

¹⁴⁵ Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P3.

¹⁴⁶ Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P3.

¹⁴⁷ Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P9.

¹⁴⁸ Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P9.

"Its 'recommendations' were compulsory... Membership, also theoretically voluntary, was in fact compulsory. The fees received from the workers and the employees made substantial resources available for use by the Labor Front."¹⁴⁹

So, the private citizen does not have a choice, but must be a part of, and contribute to, the state. Sorry - the state-created but supposedly 'private' organization. Seriously, did *any* of the Marxists who used it to counter me, actually read this article? Clearly they didn't.

"Public welfare, largely under the jurisdiction of local and district authorities before 1933, was partly transferred by the Nazi government to affiliates of the Nazi party, particularly to the Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt (National Socialist People's Welfare Organization-NSV)."¹⁵⁰

And again, not only was it a part of the Nazi-Party (which was the State), but it was also compulsory and you were forced to pay for it. Doesn't sound like the private citizen is in control, does it?

Then he talks about the literature from the time -

"On one hand, the intense growth of governmental regulations on markets, which heavily restricted economic freedom, suggests that the rights inherent to private property were destroyed. As a result, privatization would be of no practical consequences since the state assumed full control of the economic system... On the other hand, the activities of private business organizations and the fact that big business had some power seemed to be grounds for inferring that the Nazis promoted private property. Privatization, in this analysis, was intended to promote the interests of the business sectors that supported the Nazi regime, as well as the interests of the Nazi elites..."¹⁵¹

Okay, so the literature is suggesting that private property was 'destroyed', and that the Nazi Party State had full control over the economy. But because 'big business' (i.e. corporations) existed, and had some power, and since the author doesn't realize that corporations are, in-fact, public sector organizations rather than private, and since he's using the Marxist definition of capitalism, which is wrong, therefore it is 'privatization'. No no, that's rubbish. Corporations are public-sector entities, not private. The Nazi Party had control over the corporations either directly or indirectly, since many of the corporations were working with the state, or were headed by people who were members of the Nazi Party. And that's why these particular businesses 'supported the Nazi regime' - because they were one and the same.

"Nazi policy was heavily dependent on Hitler's decisions. Hitler made no specific comments on nationalization or denationalization in *Mein Kampf*. Even if Hitler was an enemy of free market economies, he could by no means be considered a

¹⁴⁹ Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P9.

¹⁵⁰ Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P9.

¹⁵¹ Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P13-14.

sympathizer of economic socialism or nationalization of private firms. The Nazi regime rejected liberalism, and was strongly against free competition and regulation of the economy by market mechanisms. Still, as a social Darwinist, Hitler was reluctant to totally dispense with private property and competition. Hitler's solution was to combine autonomy and a large role for private initiative and ownership rights within firms with the total subjection of property rights outside the firm to State control. As Nathan pointed out "It was a totalitarian system of government control within the framework of private property and private profit. It maintained private enterprise and provided profit incentives as spurs to efficient management. But the traditional freedom of the entrepreneur was narrowly circumscribed." In other words, there was private initiative in the production process, but no private initiative was allowed in the distribution of the product. Owners could act freely within their firms, but faced tight restrictions in the market."¹⁵²

So basically, Bel is saying that the Nazi Party had control over the wider economy, but didn't have control of individual firms which were 'privately' owned. The problem is that they weren't 'privately' owned at all, and, as the 'Vampire Economy' by Günter Reimann points out, businessmen couldn't act freely within their firms (which Bel is stating here). He's right that Hitler didn't fully-nationalize the firms in the traditional sense, but to conclude that this was 'privatization' would be false. The State managers of the factories could 'own' them and receive profits from them, but that's about it. They were part of the state, they were controlled by the state, and thus, they were the state.

This one source, which is used as a 'gotcha' by the Marxists denying the historical reality, is fundamentally flawed because the author does not understand the difference between the public and private sectors of the economy. If you think the Nazi Party State was a private organization, go and watch my Public vs Private video, it will set you straight. (Link in the description.)

Ultimately, there's a fundamental misunderstanding of what Hitler is trying to do. On the one hand, Hitler recognizes that Socialism is the desired outcome, and wants state-control. But he also sees the dangers of having total-state ownership of the economy. He - and many other Germans - had seen what the Bolsheviks had done in Russia during and after the Russian Civil War. They basically killed their own economy through total state-ownership of the economy. So, like the Keynesians who would follow, the National Socialists under Hitler's leadership decided to take *total-control* of the economy, rather than *total-ownership* like the Bolsheviks had done. That way the State can remain in total power, but allow some initiative within the economy, and hopefully not have an economic collapse like in the Soviet Union.

"Free life is as natural as the battle out there in nature, which also does not have any compunctions and destroys many living beings, so that only what is healthy survives. If this principle were to be removed by nationalization, then the principles of civil administration would be applied to the structure of our whole economic life and we

¹⁵² Bel, "Against the Mainstream," P17.

would experience a pitiful collapse. We cannot achieve any sort of human progress at all in a completely bureaucratic economy.”¹⁵³

I do agree with Bel in certain instances though -

“It is likely that privatization – as a policy favorable to private property – was used as a tool for fostering the alliance between Nazi government and industrialists. The government sought to win support for its policies from big business, even though most industrialists had been reluctant to support the Nazi party before it took power.”

¹⁵⁴

And in a lot of cases, I don't disagree with Bel, I just see it slightly differently.

“Several radical officers of the Nazi Party appearing before the Banking Investigation Committee... proposed the nationalization of the entire banking system in accordance with the Nazi Economic and Social Program and the Nazi Electoral Manifesto...”¹⁵⁵

“In the end, the Banking Investigation Committee recommended strengthening public supervision and control of private banking and introducing new restrictions on the creation of credit institutions and the exercise of the banking profession. These recommendations were implemented through the German Bank Act of 1934, which allowed the government to exercise tight control over private banks. Regulating banking appeared to the regime as a safe and economically sound alternative to proposals by party radicals for controlling finance through socialization.”¹⁵⁶

So, Bel uses this as a way of showing that it's 'privatization'. But my interpretation is different. To me, regulating and restricting the free market, or the economy, was socialization. The State didn't 'nationalize' the banking sector, but they *had* collective control over it. Same with the industries. 'Ownership' and 'control' are two sides of the same coin. The State had control, therefore the State had de facto ownership.

“The reprivatization of United Steel Works, which put Fritz Thyssen in the leading position in the trust, appears to be an example of the use of privatization to increase political support. It is worth remembering that Thyssen had been one of the only two big industrialists to support the Nazi Party before it became the most powerful party in the political scene.”¹⁵⁷

Yes, and from 1933, he was also a member of the Nazi Party, which was the state. So this wasn't 'privatization'. The State was selling State-firms to itself and calling it 'privatization'.

¹⁵³ Hitler, speech to DAF on 16 May 1934, from Zitelmann, “Hitler: The Policies of Seduction,” P225.

¹⁵⁴ Bel, “Against the Mainstream,” P19.

¹⁵⁵ Bel, “Against the Mainstream,” P19-20.

¹⁵⁶ Bel, “Against the Mainstream,” P20.

¹⁵⁷ Bel, “Against the Mainstream,” P20.

Thus, read with a critical eye, Bel's 'Against the Mainstream' actually supports what I'm saying, and does not 'prove' that the Nazis privatized the economy. But it's clear that the Marxists using this as 'proof' haven't actually read it, or if they have, don't understand it. Bottom line: the Marxists shouldn't be taking the Nazis at their word when they, or their contemporaries, or people who don't know any better today, call State-control of the economy 'privatization'. This wasn't 'privatization'. And people who call the National Socialist economy "*capitalism*" or "*state capitalism*" are, thus, wrong. This was state-control of the economy: which is Socialism.

Part 2: 'Crushing' the Trade Unions

One of the counterarguments that Marxists often make is that the Nazis 'crushed' the trade unions. They then claim that the Nazis were not for the working class, and thus they are not *real* Socialists.

Well, there's several problems with this narrative. First, the National Socialist German Workers' Party didn't 'abolish' or 'crush' all the trade unions. In fact, what they did was nationalize them into the state trade union: the DAF - the German Labour Front (mentioned previously). So, they collectivised the workers by bringing the trade unions into the State. Any trade unions that resisted were 'crushed', but the rest were absorbed and consolidated, not destroyed. So straight away, the Marxist narrative doesn't tell the full story.

Secondly, Lenin also crushed the trade unions once he got into power. Was he not a *real* Socialist either?

Well, there's two reasons as to why both Hitler and Lenin abolished 'private' trade unions, and set up their own 'public' trade unions. The first was because they were Socialists - they want everything run by the state (socialism: state control of the means of production). They don't want private control of the means of production (which is capitalism). Since trade unions are private organizations, and private organizations are outside State control, they must be crushed or brought under the control of the state.

The second reason is because, if the workers are in a socialist paradise and the state is looking after your needs, then there would be no need for trade unions. Under socialism the State is meant to be on the side of the workers. So if trade unions were against the state, that implies that the State is against the workers, and that can't be allowed, can it?

Thus, in reality, crushing trade unions and creating state trade unions in their place is what socialists do. The Nazis set up the German Labour Front trade union - the DAF. And the Soviets set up their workers' trade unions, also known as councils - in Russian the word 'council' is known as a 'Soviet'. Therefore, Hitler 'crushing' the trade unions and forming a state trade union is an indication that he is, in fact, a socialist.

Part 3: Down with Profit

Hitler believed in what he called the 'Primacy of Politics'. He believed that economics should come second to politics - just like many other socialists do. Profit would come second to the needs of the people. Therefore, he was not driven by market forces. He would bend the market to suit his needs - Autarky and Living Space being two primary examples of this. And at no point does Hitler, or any of his ideological-driven colleagues, say "we're going East to get lots of money!" So, to conclude that is simply false.

But the Marxists, eager to distance themselves from Hitler, haven't interpreted this 'Primacy of Politics' concept correctly. Instead of it being an indication that Hitler wanted the economy to bow to the State, they said that this was 'proof' that Hitler didn't care about economics. They even went as far to say that Hitler knew nothing about economics, and that historians should not bother looking at the Nazi economy at all, since there was nothing special about it. In fact, this is why historians only recently (last couple of decades) started looking properly into the economy of the Third Reich, because the prevailing view was that it was capitalism, and thus nothing special.¹⁵⁸ That, and the fact that most historians (Marxist or not) don't understand basic economics, and so it was an easy excuse not to look at the Nazi economy.

The fact is though that Hitler put politics first, before the economy, which is exactly what socialism calls for. Yes, Hitler does know nothing about economics, but that's because he's a socialist, because the reason people are socialists is because they don't understand basic economics. But even though these people know nothing about economics, they continue to talk about it and act as if they do. And Hitler did the exact same thing, insisting that the economy bow to the State, even though that's a disastrous economic policy that, once again, led to millions of people being enslaved, starved and murdered. But it wasn't *real* Socialism, it was "state capitalism" or something, just like Venezuela.

And yes, the Nazis did have to keep their economy afloat, so they had to deal with money. Thus, you can read texts like Aly's 'Hitler's Beneficiaries' and Tooze's 'Wages of Destruction' and see the Nazis dealing with banking issues and so on. But the idea of Socialism does not say that the State cannot make a profit when it controls the economy (not that they did anyway - their economy was imploding, which is why they went to war, but whatever). So, the counterargument that the Nazis were supposedly guided by a 'profit-motive' doesn't undermine the idea that they were Socialist even if it was true. Only *some* Marxists believe that profit is bad (because they don't understand what profit is, nor what it means). So the most you can conclude from this is that this wasn't Marxism, which I'm not saying it is.

Then you have the fact that business profits were being controlled in various different ways. We have lots of statistics about the Nazi economy, but -

"The figures do not show what happens to the profits, how large a proportion of them are absorbed by taxes, nor what the businessman is permitted to do with the portion that is left to him. They give little hint of the extent to which the government intervenes in every business transaction. They do not reveal whether the individual businessman is permitted to raise his prices if his costs advance nor whether he is

¹⁵⁸ Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P206-225.

allowed to shut down a department or even an entire factory, the operation of which is proving unprofitable.”¹⁵⁹

Reimann quotes from a German businessman’s letter to an American businessman -

“We businessmen still make sufficient profit, sometimes even large profits, but we never know how much we are going to be able to keep...”¹⁶⁰

There was also price and wage controls.

“A peasant was arrested and put on trial for having repeatedly sold his dog together with a pig. When a private buyer of pigs came to him, a sale was staged according to the official rules. The buyer would ask the peasant: “How much is the pig?” The cunning peasant would answer: “I cannot ask you for more than the official price. But how much will you pay for my dog which I also want to sell.” Then the peasant and the buyer of the pig would no longer discuss the price of the pig, but only the price of the dog. They would come to an understanding about the price of the dog, and when an agreement was reached, the buyer got the pig too. The price for the pig was quite correct, strictly according to the rules, but the buyer had paid a high price for the dog. Afterward, the buyer, wanting to get rid of the useless dog, released him, and he ran back to his old master for whom he was indeed a treasure.”¹⁶¹

And it goes on -

“...manufacturers may introduce changes in standardized products which result in making the finished article more complicated, solely for the purpose of enabling the manufacturer to claim that the finished product is a “new article,” which will not be subject to the old price restrictions.”¹⁶²

“Plainclothesmen approach traders as harmless buyers offering them higher prices than those officially set. Such “control purchases” are executed by secret policy agents in order to strengthen “national discipline” among businessmen. It often happens that the plainclothesman even makes a special effort to induce the businessman to make an illegal transaction.”¹⁶³

The idea that National Socialist Germany was capitalist, and was benefiting the corporations solely for the purpose of exploiting the poor, is simply a myth. The tax burden was placed on the corporations, rather than the people.¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁹ Reimann, “The Vampire Economy,” P4-5.

¹⁶⁰ German businessman, from Reimann, “The Vampire Economy,” P5-7.

¹⁶¹ Reimann, “The Vampire Economy,” P67-68.

¹⁶² Reimann, “The Vampire Economy,” P68.

¹⁶³ Reimann, “The Vampire Economy,” P70.

¹⁶⁴ Aly, “Hitler’s Beneficiaries,” P38.

"Populist social and tax policies benefited families. The income tax law of October 1934 dramatically raised the basic exemption, bettering the lot of low-income wage earners."¹⁶⁵

"Family and child tax credits, marriage loans, and home-furnishing and child-education allowances were among the measures with which the state tried to relieve the financial burden on parents and encourage Germans to have more children."¹⁶⁶

In 1941, the government also raised pensions by an average of about 15 percent. Mandatory health insurance was also introduced.¹⁶⁷ And the lower-income Germans benefited the most from this type of economy - in the short-term, at least - because they were able to pay off their mortgages, and loans. Those who lost their homes in the bombings received household belongings directly from the state - taken from deported Jews, of course.¹⁶⁸ Even in 1944 and 1945, with the economy in collapse and the Third Reich in financial dire straits, the Nazi leadership refused to entertain the idea of a tax increase in case it caused unrest in the civilian population.¹⁶⁹

Price and rent controls prevented prices and rents from rising.¹⁷⁰ Child support and household subsidies increased by 25 percent in 1939, 28 percent in 1940, 56 percent in 1941, and 96 percent in 1942.¹⁷¹

"Supplemental benefit payments for rent, insurance, coal, potatoes, and other daily needs were paid out with minimal bureaucratic delay. The state offered household assistance to families with large numbers of children. It also provided money for special expenditures such as dental bills or children's education costs."¹⁷²

"...although average household income levels were somewhat lower than in peacetime, stable prices, a freeze on rents, and an exemption from asset seizure made it possible to live in material comfort. If one factors into the equation soldiers' wages and their food rations, many German families actually had more disposable income in war than in peacetime."¹⁷³

Of course, there's a difference between cash income and purchasing power, but let's just ignore that for the moment. The point is that the State was trying to benefit the poor.

¹⁶⁵ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P38.

¹⁶⁶ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P38-39.

¹⁶⁷ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P55.

¹⁶⁸ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P58.

¹⁶⁹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P59-60.

¹⁷⁰ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P62.

¹⁷¹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P72.

¹⁷² Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P71.

¹⁷³ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P71.

And it does appear that the poor, the working class, and women, were benefiting from all these policies. But who was paying for them? Well, a large part of the cost came from the profits of businesses, which were suffering under a heavy tax strain.

"The extreme populism of Nazi Germany's wartime tax policies is underscored by the government's readiness to tax business and the country's wealthy. Under the requirements of the KWVO, German companies were compelled as of September 1939 to hand over all additional war-related profits to the state."¹⁷⁴

"In another blow to businesses, the Wehrmacht reduced its advance payments for armaments and increasingly took its time settling its bills."¹⁷⁵

Prior to the war, tax on profits were increased for all businesses with annual returns of more than 50,000 reichsmarks. This tax reached 40%. But in mid-1941, this was raised again to 50% of profits. And on the first of January, it was raised to 55%.¹⁷⁶

"Industrialists complained that some 80 to 90 percent of business profits were being siphoned off by the state. This figure is clearly exaggerated, but it speaks volumes about the Nazi government's basic tax-policy orientation."¹⁷⁷

I'm not so sure that they were exaggerated. As Günter Reimann points out, we do have lots of statistics about the Nazi economy. But measuring the economy by them isn't exactly possible, since the figures themselves are hiding many other manipulations in the economy.¹⁷⁸ This is actually what Mises pointed out as well about socialists economies - that without a free market price system, all economic calculation is impossible. Basically, the statistics are based on bogus numbers, because the prices and production factors have been manipulated.¹⁷⁹

"Without calculation, economic activity is impossible. Since under Socialism economic calculation is impossible, under Socialism there can be no economic activity in our sense of the word."¹⁸⁰

"They [the statistics] do not reveal how Germany's new prosperity is distributed - whether it is shared by all industries or by only a few, and whether it is confined to a comparatively few large units. The figures do not show what happens to the profits, how large a proportion of them are absorbed by taxes, nor what the businessman is permitted to do with the portion that is left to him. They give little hint of the extent to which the government intervenes in every business transaction. They do not reveal whether the individual businessman is permitted to raise his prices if his costs

¹⁷⁴ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P60.

¹⁷⁵ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P61.

¹⁷⁶ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P61.

¹⁷⁷ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P68.

¹⁷⁸ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," P4-5.

¹⁷⁹ Mises, "Socialism," P99-113.

¹⁸⁰ Mises, "Socialism," P103

advance nor whether he is allowed to shut down a department or even an entire factory, the operation of which is proving unprofitable.”¹⁸¹

Quite simply, this idea that the National Socialists are driven by profit, and thus were capitalist, doesn't work. It only proves that it wasn't Marxism, which it isn't. And the idea that the economy only benefited the large corporations is also not strictly true. Yes, the corporations may have benefited in some ways, but the State controlled them, and used them to benefit the workers and the poor. Or, at least, attempted to.

Part 4: Nazi Commissars

In their response to me, one Marxist said that they searched the internet for five minutes and could not find any evidence that the Nazis used commissars. Therefore I was lying, and making stuff up. This was, apparently, enough evidence to convince all the other Marxists responding to that post, that I was indeed making stuff up. Well, those Marxists are about to be disappointed.

“A member of the “old guard,” Joseph Wagner, was appointed Price Commissar. He has a huge administrative staff at his disposal and keeps in close touch with the police to insure the effectiveness of his decisions. His job is to fix both wholesale and retail prices for raw materials as well as for finished goods.

“It is the duty of the Price Commissar to see that a stable price level is maintained. Price increases are forbidden and in many cases reductions are not allowed.”¹⁸²

This isn't the only contemporary source saying that 'stable prices' were the objective, with Neumann's “Behemoth” saying it too.¹⁸³

I want to point out at this moment that the Nazis, much like the Keynesians and other socialists, believed that 'stable prices' were desirable. Falling prices (deflation) means less profit to tax. Less tax means that governments have to cut back, since, unlike the producers in society, they can only gain wealth by stealing (or exploiting) it off the workers. Thus, Keynesians and similar like to push for inflation - raising prices. That's why they print currency. Well, the Nazis had price commissars and were aiming for stable prices, and so is the European Central Bank.

“The primary objective of the ECB – price stability – is clearly established in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union... The Governing Council clarified in 2003 that in the pursuit of price stability it aims to maintain inflation rates below, but close to, 2% over the medium term.”¹⁸⁴

¹⁸¹ Reimann, “The Vampire Economy,” P4-5.

¹⁸² Reimann, “The Vampire Economy,” P71.

¹⁸³ Neumann, “Behemoth,” P306.

¹⁸⁴ ECB “The definition of price stability”

<https://www.ecb.europa.eu/mopo/strategy/pricestab/html/index.en.html>

The Federal Reserve of the United States even goes so far as to say that there's a "consensus" among economists regarding price stability... which is not only not true, but they're painting it to be this great and wonderful policy which doesn't lead to the economic instability of the boom and bust cycle, nor is it theft on a grand scale.¹⁸⁵ But I've already done a video on what causes Recessions, so I won't go into that here. The point though is that only socialists and Keynesians believe in 'stable prices'. Capitalists understand basic economics, and know that prices can (and indeed) should come down.

So, Hitler and the Nazis are following a socialist and Keynesian policy. And we shouldn't be surprised by that.

"To increase his prices a dealer must have a special permit from the Price Commissar. A request for a price increase must first be certified to by the group leader; it must be accompanied by a detailed statement of necessity and other pertinent data, such as production and distribution costs."¹⁸⁶

So, private businessmen could not raise and lower prices as they wished, and must bow down to what the State dictated. Again, an indication that this was not capitalism, but was socialism.

The Price Commissar - Wagner - issued the 'Price Stop Decree', freezing prices.¹⁸⁷ He was then overwhelmed with complaints. Prices had to increase due to the rising costs of production, which, in turn was caused by the scarcity of resources imposed upon the Reich by the Autarky policy.¹⁸⁸

"There were a number of official definitions of the "justified" price. At first the definition was that the price should be "reasonable," then that it should represent the cost of production plus a "reasonable" profit. But there was no effective control of production costs and what might constitute a "reasonable profit" remained a mystery. However, all this was soon forgotten when manufacturers started complaining about the tremendous increase in the cost of raw materials and other expenses. A new definition had to be found: the price must be "justified from the point of view of national economy." This was still more mysterious and vague. In reality it meant that the price level of any given commodity no longer depended merely on economic conditions, but also on political factors."¹⁸⁹

Because retailers weren't selling products at the legal price, consumers were forced to purchase at higher prices, making their transactions illegal.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁵ Bernanke, "The Benefits of Price Stability," 2006, The Federal Reserve
<https://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/bernanke20060224a.htm>

¹⁸⁶ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," P71.

¹⁸⁷ Neumann, "Behemoth," P306. Reimann, The Vampire Economy, P71-72.

¹⁸⁸ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," P71-72.

¹⁸⁹ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," P74-75.

¹⁹⁰ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," P86.

"Police, making their regular visits, are informed by the retailers that they were just about to put price tags on or that the goods had just arrived. As a matter of principle, this kind of excuse cannot be condoned any longer. Fixed maximum prices are ignored; shrewd businessmen mark the prescribed maximum price on one side of the price tag, and a higher price on the other side. Even when official prices are quoted, forbidden price increases must be looked for... Special attention must be paid to the firm's books."¹⁹¹

The private businessman is being controlled by the State. None of this sounds like a free market to me. Another decree -

"...lowered the price of the potash syndicate by 30 per cent. This decree was hailed as a manifestation of truly socialist spirit."¹⁹²

That's right, the setting up of cartels and corporations allowed the state to more easily enforce its economic policies. As this example shows, the cartels didn't necessarily benefit from Nazi rule, as the Marxists claim.

"According to Nazi price statistics - which are misleading - many articles are cheaper than they were before the advent of the Price Commissar. In reality, prices which were officially reduced actually have risen."¹⁹³

Yes, a pretty Orwellian nightmare. Your chocolate ration has increased from thirty grams to twenty.¹⁹⁴

"Within a few months after the announcement of the Price Stop Decree, the Price Commissar had to retreat; price increases were granted for numerous industries dependent on foreign raw materials, especially in view of the fact that they could not obtain ersatz materials without paying exorbitant prices. Growing taxation and increased administrative work were further factors adding to production costs."¹⁹⁵

This exact same point is also brought up by Neumann's contemporary source.¹⁹⁶

"At least half the time of a German manufacturer is spent on the problem of how to get scarce raw materials. These cannot be obtained without a certificate from one of the supervisory boards which distribute the available raw materials, domestic as well as foreign. Usually a manufacturer needs dozens of different materials. He cannot work without any one of them."¹⁹⁷

¹⁹¹ Theo Loehr, in Die Deutsche Polizei (SS), 10 January 1939. Quoted from Reimann, The Vampire Economy, P83.

¹⁹² Neumann, "Behemoth," P309.

¹⁹³ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," P75.

¹⁹⁴ Orwell, "Nineteen Eighty-Four," P61-62.

¹⁹⁵ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," P72.

¹⁹⁶ Neumann, "Behemoth," P309.

¹⁹⁷ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," P51.

"These supervisory boards estimate how much iron, steel, copper, rubber and other raw materials are needed by the whole country in order to carry out certain production programs."¹⁹⁸

The boards for steel and iron were set-up by a decree in the August of 1934. So-called 'directives' from the boards were actually 'quotas', and the state sent out "quota agents" to make sure their demands were being met.¹⁹⁹

"A steel industrialist who needs iron or steel or any other material has to submit his demand to his economic group, which then decides whether or not he is to receive the supply."²⁰⁰

This really does not sound like a free market. It actually sounds similar to what the Soviet Union had. You get allocated resources dependent upon what the central distribution system decides. And everything else you do is controlled by the State. And yet, this constitutes as capitalism, somehow.

And you may argue - 'but it was only for iron and steel, and things for the war effort, not for the whole economy, so it wasn't *real* socialism' - but you'd be wrong. There was another 'supervisory board' for paper. Neumann actually says that this forced the paper industry to group into cartels, which the state then appointed 'deputies' to oversee.²⁰¹ There was also boards demanding coal quotas, textile quotas, battery quotas... Again, none of this sounds like a free market to me.²⁰²

"There are other authorities, such as the Reichsbank, the Commissar for Foreign Currency, the Price Commissar, the War Department Business Council, etc., which might nullify the policy of the Raw Material Boards."²⁰³

There's numerous other references to commissars in the Vampire Economy alone, but I have quoted enough here. And, despite the Marxists who are adamant that Nazi Commissars don't exist and you can't find any information about them online, there *is* information available online about these commissars. Even Wikipedia (a Marxist's favourite source) mentions them. Just look up Josef Terboven, Reichskommissar for occupied Norway, as but one example.²⁰⁴

Of course, some books (especially those written or translated by Marxist-sympathisers) and some parts of Wikipedia don't call them 'commissars', instead, referring to them as 'commissioners'.²⁰⁵ However, the actual term they used was 'kommissar' - with a 'k' - not 'commissioner'. So, the Nazis did have commissars, whether the Marxists like it or not.

¹⁹⁸ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," P52.

¹⁹⁹ Neumann, "Behemoth," P251.

²⁰⁰ Neumann, "Behemoth," P251.

²⁰¹ Neumann, "Behemoth," P251-252.

²⁰² Neumann, "Behemoth," P252-254.

²⁰³ Reimann, "The Vampire Economy," P52.

²⁰⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Josef_Terboven

²⁰⁵ Neumann, "Behemoth," P305-306.

Part 5: Collective Agriculture

Engels writes -

"Question 17: Will it be possible for private property to be abolished at one stroke?

"No, no more than existing forces of production can at one stroke be multiplied to the extent necessary for the creation of a communal society."

"In all probability, the proletarian revolution will transform existing society gradually and will be able to abolish private property only when the means of production are available in sufficient quantity."²⁰⁶

Well similarly, Hitler wanted to wait until after he had conquered Living Space in the East *before* he implemented major agriculture reforms. As we discussed earlier, he couldn't implement full-socialism until he had the resources of the East.²⁰⁷ But, even still, there were attempts at implementing those reforms earlier than that. On the 26th of September 1933, Darré and Backe created the "Erbhof" law.²⁰⁸

"For the purpose of protecting the peasantry as the 'Blood Source of the German People', the law proposed to create a new category of farm, the Erbhof (hereditary farm), protected against debt, insulated from market forces and passed down from generation to generation within racially pure peasant families. The law applied to all farms that were sufficient in size to provide a German family with an adequate standard of living... but did not exceed 125 hectares."²⁰⁹

So clearly, this isn't capitalism. This is the collective, public state control of the economy. This was collectivisation. The public sector decided that such farms could not be repossessed or sold. The public dictated that Jews could not have these farms, and for the farms -

"The line of inheritance was now fixed in law."²¹⁰

So this was clearly not free-market capitalism.

"Coupled with this extraordinary intervention in the property rights of German peasants was an equally drastic programme of debt reduction. Backe and Darré proposed that the Erbhof farmers should assume collective responsibility for each other's debts."²¹¹

²⁰⁶ Engels, "The Principles of Communism," P49.

²⁰⁷ Zitelmann, Hitler: "The Policies of Seduction," P30-31, P91, P236, P291-292, P451.

²⁰⁸ Tooze, "'Wages of Destruction,'" P182.

²⁰⁹ Tooze, "'Wages of Destruction,'" P182.

²¹⁰ Tooze, "'Wages of Destruction,'" P183.

²¹¹ Tooze, "Wages of Destruction," P183.

Collective responsibility? Collective control of the economy? Yep, definitely sounds like socialism to me.

"The debts of all Erbhoefe, variously estimated at between 6 and 9 billion Reichsmarks, were to be transferred to the Rentenbank Kreditanstalt, a state-sponsored mortgage bank. The Rentenbank would repay the original creditors with interest ranging between 2 and 4 per cent depending on the security of the original loan."²¹²

So, no more private debt for the farmers, but collective debt. Again, very socialist. And, despite being a super-big capitalist like the Marxists say, Hitler approved of this plan. Well, hold on, why? Why would capitalist Hitler approve of a plan which was clearly designed to collectivize the farms?

Now, what ended up happening was - Hitler had to compromise because of opposition from the Junkers (land owners), from some of the peasants themselves, and from Schacht (plus others), so negotiations began. In the end (to cut a long story short) they had to shelve the debt-relief idea and come up with a compromise 'grant' scheme instead for the peasants who were in debt. They also had to relax the inheritance elements of the law to appease the peasants.

As Tooze points out, in the end, it wasn't enough to "transform the structure of land ownership in Germany." But it did have an impact.²¹³

"It consolidated a group of farms whose average size nationally was just less than 20 hectares, a figure that was soon to be defined as the ideal size for efficient family farming in the new order of German agriculture."²¹⁴

Now, again, some may argue that this wasn't "full-socialism". But, even if we agree with such a statement, that does not mean that this was capitalism. And I personally think that people who were trying to implement socialism, and supposedly failed to implement it (because they didn't conquer the East or had opposition to it), were still socialists. To conclude that they are therefore capitalist is simply wrong. The Nazis of the Third Reich were failed socialists, to add to the long list of failed socialist attempts throughout the past two centuries.

But it's understandable why Marxists would want to distance themselves from yet another version of socialism which resulted in the mass starvation of millions of people. The idea was to prepare Germany for war, so Backe was constantly trying to build up a centralized stockpile of grain reserves. He built warehouses and silos, and used tax breaks and other incentives to control private industry to this end.²¹⁵ They also created the RNS, an

²¹² Tooze, "Wages of Destruction," P183.

²¹³ Tooze, "Wages of Destruction," P183-186.

²¹⁴ Tooze, "Wages of Destruction," P186.

²¹⁵ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P169.

organization which fixed prices and introduced production controls, which "marked the end of the free market for agricultural produce in Germany."²¹⁶

The farmers were granted billions in price subsidies.

"Indeed, the prices producers were paid for milk and potatoes were raised by 25 to 35 percent in the course of the war."²¹⁷

Bearing in mind, food rationing was introduced in the August of 1939. Backe and his friends reduced the rations of meat and eggs so as to concentrate on grain production, which they believed was a more productive use of land. It supposedly took five kilograms of grain to produce one kilogram of meat.²¹⁸

Interestingly, the British came to a similar conclusion and tried to swap from meat production to bread and potatoes in World War Two, with mixed results. Evidence is now coming to light that, just like all socialist projects, state-controls on agriculture either had a small gain or actually resulted in a reduction in food production.²¹⁹

Also, this idea that meat production is less efficient than grain production, is the same excuse used these days by people pushing for us all to eat bread, rather than meat. Save the animals, or something. What they don't understand is that you need to eat more meals per day to get the same amount of energy from agriculture farming as you could get from two, or even one meal which includes meat. And carbohydrates - which bread is basically made of - has led to the obesity epidemic that's plaguing western countries, which also spiked after the US government decided to announce in the 1980s that bread was what everyone should consume. Coincidence?²²⁰

Yet, despite their attempts to do otherwise, it appears that the Germans in World War Two may have had similar results to the British state's farming intervention scheme. There were definite shortfalls in food production. And grain reserves went from 5.5 million tons in the June of 1939 to 1.2 million tons in 1943.²²¹ This is despite the fact that the German Army was stealing food off of all of Europe by that point, redistributing it either to themselves, or back home.²²²

²¹⁶ Tooze, "Wages of Destruction," P186.

²¹⁷ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P55.

²¹⁸ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P170.

²¹⁹ Collingham, "The Taste of War," P90-96.

²²⁰ PragerU, "How the Government Made You Fat," <https://youtu.be/Q7vJZAYoFPk>

Dr. Eric Berg DC, "Dr. Berg's Healthy Ketogenic Diet Basics: START HERE,"

https://youtu.be/vMZfyEy_jpl

Dr. Eric Berg DC, "Let's NOT Fight the War Against Obesity," <https://youtu.be/UU6ePvtFkSQ>

Dr. Eric Berg DC, "The Answer to Obesity Is Obvious If You Look at the Statistics,"

https://youtu.be/Erk4_jFDjzQ

Dr. Eric Berg DC, "Benefits of One Meal a Day Intermittent Fasting," <https://youtu.be/KYCoep237nQ>

²²¹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P170.

²²² Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P170. Collingham, The Taste of War, P184-190.

"Along the route taken by the German invaders, whole stretches of land were left stripped of anything edible."²²³

This was why the German leadership decided to besiege or otherwise starve large cities like Leningrad and Kharkov, because the food that was going to them was needed by the Germans.²²⁴

"In Kharkov 15,000 Jews were murdered that winter [1941], supposedly in order to alleviate the food situation. In Kiev the German authorities claimed that a systematic massacre of Jews on 29 and 30 September had alleviated the food and housing conditions for the rest of the civilian population."²²⁵

The situation in Poland, thanks to all the controls, was desperate.

"By the winter of 1941-42 the black market in the General Government had grown into a second economy over which the administration had no control. While the shops were empty... the streets were alive with black market traders. This was unsurprising as the ration was so inadequate that the only means of survival for the urban population was to buy food illegally. Workers were absent from work for at least two days a week while they went into the countryside to barter for food. As a consequence, factories needed to employ more people and the shortage of food led to a constant state of friction with the occupying forces."²²⁶

The same thing happened in the Ukraine as well.²²⁷ In all cases, the free market was not allowed to function. Capitalism it was not. This was Socialism.

Part 6: IG Farben vs the Market Economy

"The liberalism of the industrial nations, the insistence on freedom and self-control over property and jobs on the part of the entrepreneurs has turned into its opposite! Now only the big ones benefit from liberalism any longer, the mass has sunk down to become the servants and to become slaves. Even in the organizations and chambers of the democracies, business sense reigns supreme, the owners of private capital, the big industrial magnates, the trusts, rule the state."²²⁸

It's interesting how Hitler doesn't realise that corporations are public sector entities. Not only that, but he doesn't realise that it was the public sector state, and the public sector central banks, which caused the corporations to grow large at the expense of the rest of the population. Taxation and inflation leech wealth from the people and redistribute it to the "big

²²³ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P171.

²²⁴ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P171-172. Collingham, The Taste of War, P180, P194-197. Snyder, "Blood Lands," P162-163, P170-173.

²²⁵ Collingham, The Taste of War, P190.

²²⁶ Collingham, The Taste of War, P206.

²²⁷ Collingham, The Taste of War, P191.

²²⁸ Hitler to Wagener, conversation in 1931, from Zitelmann P224.

ones". And yet, just like all socialists, Hitler didn't like the socialism when he wasn't in power. Instead, he wanted to seize power himself, and become one of the "big ones" that benefited from the socialist system.

Speaking of the "big ones", IG Farben was one of Germany's largest corporations. In 1925, when the world gasoline price was about 16 Pfennig per liter, it started dabbling in synthetic fuel production. It thought that synthetic petrol would cost about 20 Pfennig per litre to make (and perhaps they hoped to bring that cost down somewhat).²²⁹ The problem was that this was the 1920s. Governments around the world (but especially the United States) had pumped cheap currency into their capital goods industries, which included oil production industries. This had formed a huge bubble of overproduction in the capital goods industries (oil, agriculture, housing, steel). Hence the term - the roaring twenties. Well, when the US government failed to counterfeit enough currency in 1929, this bubble popped. And, without their fix of counterfeit currency, the capital goods industries had to raise capital in other ways. They realized that they had overexpanded, so the only way to actually sell their products to consumers who didn't want them, was to cut their prices. The result was falling prices for goods produced in the overexpanded capital goods industries (again: oil, agriculture, housing, and steel).²³⁰

"By 1931... natural gasoline cost only 5.2 Pfennig per liter, while synthetic gasoline cost 23 Pfennig per liter, and IG Farben was in trouble."²³¹

Clearly, the people in the market did not want highly expensive synthetic fuel which was incredibly costly to make, when they could choose a cheaper alternative. And since the consumer didn't want expensive fuel, there would be no way to sell synthetic fuel to the market and recover the cost of making such fuel. Therefore, the lack of profit was telling IG Farben that it should not invest more into this project, since the resources of society would be best used elsewhere. Capitalism was telling Germany to stop producing synthetic fuel because the people didn't want it.

"Within months of taking power, the National Socialists, backed by the military, pressed for the expansion of domestic petroleum output irrespective of the cost. State Secretary Gottfried Feder, one of the founders of the German National Socialist Workers' Party... and now responsible for petroleum affairs at the RWM, pledged that all available measures would be utilized to fulfill Hitler's plan to promote motorization, including increasing the production of synthetic fuel, expanding existing refinery capacity, and raising the output of domestic oilfields. Feder had initially backed the construction of additional oil refineries, but by the autumn of 1933, he was committed to higher synthetic fuel production. Policy would not be determined solely by trade and foreign exchange considerations or even cost (since synthetic fuel cost three times as much as imported gasoline – about 20 RM vs. 6 RM), but also employment

²²⁹ Toprani, "Oil and Grand Strategy," P313.

²³⁰ Rothbard, "America's Great Depression."

²³¹ Toprani, "Oil and Grand Strategy," P313.

and strategic factors, and synthetic production and importation of crude oil would be encouraged "simultaneously."²³²

Against what the consumers in the market actually wanted - against sound economic policy - the State decided to pour the resources of society into synthetic oil production. It did this because the State wanted to go to war. It did not do this in order to make money. It did not do this in order to make profit. It couldn't make profit, since the cost of synthetic fuel was much higher than market prices of imported fuel. Instead, the State printed currency and pumped it into IG Farben, instructing it to expand its synthetic oil production facilities no matter the cost.

But, because certain 'scholars' believe that the Third Reich and IG Farben were monopoly capitalism,²³³ and since Marxists don't know the actual definition of the term 'socialism', they somehow interpreted this as free market capitalist forces in pursuit of profit. Such an interpretation not only flies against the evidence, but also hides the fact that the Nazi State "rationally regulat[ed] their interchange with Nature [the free market], bringing it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it", which is exactly what Marxism says.²³⁴

In their criticism of me, Marxists claimed that IG Farben was a big benefactor of the Holocaust, and that the Holocaust was therefore driven by capitalism. Again, not only do they forget that IG Farben is a corporation, and thus a public company rather than a private company (making them non-capitalist to begin with), but they also haven't looked into the Holocaust to any great degree.

Not only had the Nazi State and the SS taken over Auschwitz in 1940, ran it, and organized the logistical effort to bring Jews and others to it, but they also enticed IG Farben to build a factory next to it in order to exploit the prisoners in the camp.²³⁵

"The plant, called IG Auschwitz, was one of the biggest, most ambitious and, at a cost of about 600 million Reichsmarks, most expensive investment projects of the German Reich in the Second World War."²³⁶

They had considered other locations, and the existence of a slave labour camp didn't guarantee that IG Farben would build their factory there. In fact, it seems they were about to choose another location. So the Reich Ministry of Economy - that's right, the State - forced through the plan. The State also gave massive financial incentives and financial support to the corporation through the 'Eastern Aid' programme.²³⁷

"The Eastern Fiscal Assistance Law of December 1940 guaranteed IG Farben tax exemption on their investments."²³⁸

²³² Toprani, "Oil and Grand Strategy," P324.

²³³ Toprani, "Oil and Grand Strategy," P329.

²³⁴ Marx, *Das Kapital* v3, P593.

²³⁵ Steinbacher, "Auschwitz," P22-27, P45-51.

²³⁶ Steinbacher, "Auschwitz," P45.

²³⁷ Steinbacher, "Auschwitz," P46-47.

²³⁸ Steinbacher, "Auschwitz," P47-48.

"On 6 February 1941 Otto Ambros and IG Farben director Fritz ter Meer held a board meeting in Berlin with Carl Krauch... who was not only a member of the board of directors of IG Farben, but also a member of the circle of industrialists around the Reichsführer-SS, known as Himmler's 'Circle of Friends'."²³⁹

It's almost like there's no difference between the Public Corporation and the Public State. Is IG Farben an organ of the State?

"Krauch presented the plan to his close friend Hermann Göring, the head of the Four Year Plan authority. On 18 February 1941 Göring asked Himmler, in his role as Reich Commissar for the Strengthening of German Nationhood, to introduce pro-settlement measures as soon as possible, and to make concentration camp inmates available for the construction of the factory."²⁴⁰

So, as you can see, the Commissar for the Strengthening of German Nationhood was not concerned about profit and capital. In relation to Auschwitz, neither Himmler nor Göring were discussing free market forces. Instead, they had a social and political agenda, and this came before economic considerations (which is in alignment with National Socialist ideology). Not only were they giving multiple financial incentives to IG Farben to construct their factory in that location in order to exploit the slave labour (which is an example of state-control of the economy), but they (the state) forced through the plan, and were 'friends' with the directors of the corporation.

"Cooperation with the largest private [actually public] company in the German Reich gave Himmler the unique chance to realize at last his desire to harness prisoner labour in economic ends... Since the mid-thirties, the Reichsführer-SS had been trying to exploit the work-force of concentration camp inmates for munitions-related purposes... to ensure economic power for the SS..."²⁴¹

(The State.)

"But these attempts were defeated by the lack of business experience among the SS and the low level of labour efficiency among the prisoners. Cooperation with IG Farben granted the opportunity to achieve those high goals."²⁴²

Oh look, the SS don't have much business experience. Not very good capitalists, are they? And this isn't the only evidence we have of businesses being taken over by state minions.

"The capital for the establishment of the new works was taken up under more or less pressure by the local textile factories. The state then appointed experts for the

²³⁹ Steinbacher, "Auschwitz," P48.

²⁴⁰ Steinbacher, "Auschwitz," P48-49.

²⁴¹ Steinbacher, "Auschwitz," P49.

²⁴² Steinbacher, "Auschwitz," P50.

management of the new corporations and sometimes secured for itself a small share of the initial capital.”²⁴³

So, IG Farben certainly isn't a one-off. At this point, Himmler assigned camp prisoners to build IG Farben.

“The Reich Ministry of Economy assigned the project a building urgency level of zero, which was given only to projects important to the war effort. IG Farben immediately acquired the factory site... Parts of the company grounds, which had belonged to Polish farmers and had been confiscated, were bought from state offices, and the rest was expropriated [or, seized by the State].”²⁴⁴

Again, this really doesn't sound like a free market economy to me. Confiscating private property is not private-control of the economy (capitalism). All of this is State, State, State and State. And State-control of the economy is socialism.

But what's interesting is that the number of prisoners only formed about a third of the workforce in the IG Farben plant. And the forced labourers weren't particularly eager to build the factory in the first place, especially with a typhus epidemic further slowing down the work. So in late 1942, IG Farben then decided to create a camp nearer to its factory - which ended up being the first concentration camp created by a corporation. Prior to this point, all concentration camps had been built by the state. However, even then, it was built exactly like the State-built concentration camps, and was guarded by the SS, which were the state.

²⁴⁵

So again, we have close cooperation between the State and the corporation, to the point that they're practically indistinguishable. And when you have State-control of the means of production, as we have in this case, that's socialism.

But, even if you somehow thought at this point that IG Farben was still a private company (somehow), and that evil profit was the reason that they built this factory, you're about to be disappointed.

“From the point of view of company finance the prisoners' work unit was not profitable even once Monowitz had been built. Although the managers agreed with the SS that the average work capacity of a prisoner was 75 per cent that of a free German worker, this prognosis soon proved to be unrealistic. In fact the capacity of the prisoners clearly fell below 50 per cent of that of a German worker, and sometimes reached only 20 per cent. Despite the minimal labour costs, IG Farben made no profit out of the prisoners' units because productivity, given inadequate nutrition, harassment and punishments, and the physically draining and psychologically humiliating work, fell far short of expectations.”²⁴⁶

²⁴³ Neumann, “Behemoth,” P281.

²⁴⁴ Steinbacher, “Auschwitz,” P51.

²⁴⁵ Steinbacher, “Auschwitz,” P51-53.

²⁴⁶ Steinbacher, “Auschwitz,” P53-56.

This is, in fact, what the classical-capitalist economists realized back in the 1600s and 1700s. Free workers, who receive incentives and rewards for doing work, will work many times harder than slaves, and be happier. This is why Britain, the first country to become liberal (in the old fashion capitalist sense), and whose economy was heavily involved in the slave trade in the early 1800s, sent its navy around the world to free the serfs and the slaves. They knew that if they freed up the economy, the economy would be more productive.²⁴⁷

This is also part of the reason socialist economies collapse. Without incentives - without being free to make choices, and receive actual rewards for working hard - workers do not work. Hence the 1970s Russian phrase "They pretend to pay us, and we pretend to work." Freeing up an economy makes the workers many times more productive, meaning that living standards for the workers will be many times higher than in socialist economies, especially as time goes on. The Germans and IG Farben in World War Two, re-learnt the lesson that the classical-capitalist economists had learnt hundreds of years before them, at great cost to the slave labour prisoners they had in their grasp.

So, I hope you can see by this section that IG Farben was certainly not a 'private' capitalist firm. It was a public corporation, controlled either directly or indirectly by the state, and while it may have been motivated by profit, and took advantage of slave labour, the central state was maneuvering it into doing its bidding. It was not driven by the market, but by politics. The State controlled the means of production in the Third Reich.

Part 7: The Imploding Social Justice Community

The term 'Volksgemeinschaft' means 'people's community'. The idea was to abolish distinctions between classes, genders and so on, and equalize all Germans in the community.²⁴⁸

"...class, as well as other bonds of affiliation and identity, and, above all, political parties based on economic interest were viewed as forms of "false consciousness" that threatened to divide racial comrades and unite racial rivals in a manner inherently inimical to the well-being of a racial collective or Volksgemeinschaft and contrary to the law of nature."²⁴⁹

Hitler promised the creation of a "socially just state", that would "eradicate all [social] barriers."²⁵⁰

After their seizure of power, the Nazis brought everyone into line, in a process of 'coordination'.

²⁴⁷ Woods, "How Did the West Abolish Slavery?" <https://youtu.be/s-py2IQzEMs>

²⁴⁸ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P30.

²⁴⁹ Browning and Siegelbaum, Chapter 6, Beyond Totalitarianism, Kindle.

²⁵⁰ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P13.

"For many people, the regime's aim of leveling out class distinctions was realized in the Hitler Youth, the National Labour Service, the major party organizations, and ultimately even in the Wehrmacht."²⁵¹

"Some clubs and societies were closed down or merged, others taken over... every club and association had to have a majority of Nazis or Steel Helmets on its executive committee. Professional associations were merged into the newly founded National Socialist Physicians' League, the National Socialist Teachers' League and similar bodies, which all those concerned knew they had to join if they were to keep their jobs... Clubs for the war disabled were merged into the National Socialist War Victims' Association, the Boy Scouts and the Young German Order into the Hitler Youth."²⁵²

The Nazis informed the feminist "Federation of German Women's Associations" on the 27th of April 1933 that it was going to be dissolved.²⁵³

"The national leader of the Nazi Women's Front, Lydia Gottschewski, declared somewhat airily that the Baden chapter had been dissolved on the basis of the law of the revolution, and enclosed a form for signature by the Federation's President, in which she was invited to submit the Federation unconditionally to the direction of Adolf Hitler, to expel all its Jewish members, to elect Nazi women to top positions and to join the Nazi Women's Front by 16 May."²⁵⁴

On the 15th of May, with no other choice, and with some of its associations already incorporated into Nazi institutions, the Federation dissolved itself.²⁵⁵

"This process of 'co-ordination' took place in the spring and summer of 1933 at every level, in every city, town and village throughout Germany. What social life remained was at the local inn, or took place in the privacy of people's homes. Individuals had become isolated except when they gathered in one Nazi organization or another. Society had been reduced to an anonymous and undifferentiated mass and then reconstituted in a new form in which everything was done in the name of Nazism."²⁵⁶

And this new culture of the people's community was very much established on a majority basis. The majority was tyrannizing the minority, but that's very much how a democracy works. However this regime wasn't maintained by force. In 1937 the Gestapo only had 7,000 employees, including bureaucrats and secretaries. They watched over 60 million people. In contrast, the Communists in East Germany after the war would employ 190,000 surveillance

²⁵¹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P30.

²⁵² Evans, "The Coming of the Third Reich," Chapter 5, Part 4.

²⁵³ Evans, "The Coming of the Third Reich," Chapter 5, Part 4.

²⁵⁴ Evans, "The Coming of the Third Reich," Chapter 5, Part 4.

²⁵⁵ Evans, "The Coming of the Third Reich," Chapter 5, Part 4.

²⁵⁶ Evans, "The Coming of the Third Reich," Chapter 5, Part 4.

experts to watch over 17 million people. So, it would be right to say that the majority of the German people fell in with what the National Socialists were doing.²⁵⁷

Of course, it wouldn't do any good to declare a people's community if 6 million of those people are unemployed. So Hitler promised to get them all back to work, which he managed to do in the first five years.²⁵⁸

"Examined closely, however, the turnaround was largely an illusion. Wages and pensions stagnated at the paltry levels of the Depression. In 1928, the best economic year of the Weimar Republic, total wages paid in Germany amounted to 42.6 billion reichsmarks. In 1935 that figure was 31.8 billion. It took three more years before wages regained their previous level, and hourly and individual wages, as well as pensions, remained lower than in the 1920s. Furthermore, annual revenues from agriculture in Nazi Germany lagged considerably behind those of 1928-29."²⁵⁹

This is supported by Overy -

"Real earnings only regained the 1929 level in 1941 under pressure of wartime labour scarcity."²⁶⁰

By the time Hitler was in power, the economy had actually hit the bottom from the Depression and was starting to recover in 1932, before the Nazis got into power, and if not during 1933 before the Nazis had time to implement most of their policies. (So the capitalist Laissez-Faire policies implemented by Brüning were starting to work).²⁶¹ But the population, persuaded by Nazi propaganda and promises of work-creation schemes and so on, was won over by this supposed Nazi economic 'recovery'. The problem was that this was a sham.²⁶² And the social program of the new Reich -

"...exceeding additional revenues by almost 300 percent [and] public debt increased in the first two years of the Nazi regime by 10.3 billion reichsmarks."²⁶³

A people's community comes at a cost. The Reich needed to find the money to pay for these social programs from somewhere before the economy imploded. And, despite annexing other countries -²⁶⁴

"...there was a budget crisis in the making. Between 1933 and mid-1939, the Third Reich spent at the very least 45 billion marks on the military, an astronomical sum for the time and more than three times the amount of total state revenues for the fiscal

²⁵⁷ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P28-29.

²⁵⁸ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P36.

²⁵⁹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P36.

²⁶⁰ Overy, "Nazi Economic Recovery," P31.

²⁶¹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P36-37. Overy, "The Nazi Economic Recovery," 1932-1938, P23.

²⁶² Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P36-37. Overy, "The Nazi Economic Recovery," 1932-1938, P1.

²⁶³ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P38.

²⁶⁴ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P18.

year 1937. Consequently, by August 1939 the national debt had reached 37.4 billion marks.²⁶⁵

German finances were in a shambles.

"In 1939, the regime needed an estimated 16.3 billion reichsmarks to cover civilian expenditures, while military outlays claimed 20.5 billion. An additional 3.3 billion marks of the total regular state revenues of between 17 and 18 billion marks went toward interest payments on past debts."²⁶⁶

But Hitler would not be dominated by market economics. Socialist politics must come first.²⁶⁷ The complaining economic experts were sacked. Schacht was replaced on the 20th of January 1939 by Walther Funk as president of the Reichsbank, with Emil Puhl becoming vice president of the Reichsbank.²⁶⁸ Still Hitler was informed on the 1st of September 1938 that the state coffers would be empty within a month.²⁶⁹

In the end, the cost of implementing Hitler's limited-socialism was too much for the Third Reich's economy to bear, and the only solution was to go to war in order to plunder the resources of Europe and export their financial problems abroad.²⁷⁰

Part 8: The Plunder of Europe

"German soldiers literally emptied the shelves of Europe. They sent millions of packages back home from the front. The recipients were mainly women. When one asks the now elderly witnesses about this period in history, their eyes still gleam at the memory of the shoes from North Africa, the velvet, silk, liqueurs, and coffee from France, the tobacco from Greece, the honey and bacon from Russia, and the tons of herring from Norway - not to mention the various gifts that poured in from Germany's allies Romania, Hungary, and Italy."²⁷¹

"Interestingly, while female respondents offered accurate descriptions of the period, the men, without exception, denied ever having sent a single package home."²⁷²

Soldiers entering occupied territories were initially limited to taking 50 reichsmarks per month with them, but this was later officially raised to 300 reichsmarks, and unofficially few were restricted from taking that. As a result, hard money values began to rise - the sign of currency inflation in the occupied territories.²⁷³

²⁶⁵ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P39.

²⁶⁶ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P40.

²⁶⁷ Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P206-239.

²⁶⁸ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P39.

²⁶⁹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P44.

²⁷⁰ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P40, P52.

²⁷¹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P97.

²⁷² Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P97.

²⁷³ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P94-95.

By late 1941, there was a food crisis in the Reich. The war had dragged on longer than the planned 12 weeks. The Germans were unprepared for this, and they were no longer receiving food supplies from the Soviet Union. 3 million soldiers had to be fed without reducing food rations within Germany itself.²⁷⁴ Not that their logistics could supply them anyway. Therefore they were ordered by the regime to 'live off the land', which they did.²⁷⁵

In a lot of cases, German soldiers simply stole whatever they wanted. Between September 1941 and August 1942, 90% of Army Group Centre's potatoes came from local sources, as did 65% of its meat and 60% of its bread. By 1943, the strain on the local economy was so much that these numbers declined, with only 11% of its meat coming from the Russian people.²⁷⁶

"Even in the depths of winter in 1943, while the Wehrmacht was suffering catastrophic defeats on the battlefield, the soldiers of the Eighteenth Army near Leningrad managed, according to statistics from the military post office, to send more than 3 million packages home. They were filled with items that had been plundered, bought at bargain prices, or left over from food rations."²⁷⁷

"Platoons of German soldiers resembled the communist brigades of a decade before, taking as much food as they could as quickly as possible."²⁷⁸

Belgium's pre-war budget had been 11 billion francs. Now the Germans were demanding an additional 18 billion annually - redistributing wealth from Belgium to Germany. Belgium had no choice but to print currency to cope with the demand. This was done to such an extent that there were signs of inflation and currency instability by October 1941.²⁷⁹

"In addition to extorting heavy contributions, Germany stole Belgian gold. In 1941, the Vichy regime in France agreed to transport from Dakar to Marseille forty-one tons of gold that the legitimate Belgian government had succeeded in shipping to French colonies in West Africa. In Marseille it was handed over to a representative of the Reichsbank."²⁸⁰

"...gold was the only means of payment the Reich could use to purchase scarce resources in noncombatant countries like Spain, Portugal (tungsten), Sweden (steel, ball bearings), Switzerland (weapons, transport vehicles), and Turkey (chrome)."²⁸¹

The economic border between Germany and Holland was abolished, and the flood of Germans into the Dutch Market brought a huge strain on the economy to the point that the

²⁷⁴ Snyder, "Blood Lands," P169.

²⁷⁵ Collingham, "The Taste of War," P184-190. Snyder, "Blood Lands," P169-170.

²⁷⁶ Collingham, "The Taste of War," P184-190.

²⁷⁷ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P102.

²⁷⁸ Snyder, "Blood Lands," P171.

²⁷⁹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P135-138.

²⁸⁰ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P138.

²⁸¹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P141.

currency border had to be reestablished in 1944 to prevent the Dutch currency from collapsing. Taxes were raised, claiming as much as 83% of all Dutch business profits.²⁸²

"No one knows exactly how many forced laborers worked in the Third Reich, but estimates usually range from 8 to 12 million."²⁸³

Workers in rural Ukraine were taken, then assets given to the village elders, who would sell them and transfer the funds to the German treasury. Food and livestock were confiscated by the local Wehrmacht divisions.²⁸⁴

"The budgetary advantages of using forced labor are obvious. It allowed the state treasury maximum access to workers' wages, thereby stabilizing wartime finances, transferring burdens from German taxpayers, and - as a welcome bonus - protecting the tight market of available consumer goods from additional spending power. Had the Reich relied instead on the increased labor output of German women or on lengthened working hours, several additional billions of reichsmarks would have come into circulation. But there would not have been anything more to buy in stores. That would have put a strain on the reichsmark and possibly had a negative effect on popular opinion."²⁸⁵

In fact -

"...wage tax revenues more than doubled between 1938 and 1943."²⁸⁶

The substantial 41% increase in 1941 can be explained by -

"...the massive use of forced laborers in German industry. Without that influx, revenues after 1940 would have diminished as Germany's wartime fortunes began to fail."²⁸⁷

I question the face value of these productivity and revenue figures, since we've seen that forced labourers in IG Farben's Auschwitz plant weren't profitable, and it's impossible to do economic calculations in an economy so manipulated.²⁸⁸ However, the point is that the Nazis were using forced labour as a way of trying to reduce the financial and resource burdens of the German economy.

"Economic logic was a motor that drove the Holocaust. The Ministry of Economics charged the National Board for Economy and Efficiency with producing a cost-benefit analysis of the Warsaw ghetto. The board issued a number of reports that cautioned

²⁸² Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P142-144.

²⁸³ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P156.

²⁸⁴ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P158.

²⁸⁵ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P162.

²⁸⁶ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P164.

²⁸⁷ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P164.

²⁸⁸ Mises, "Socialism," P99-103.

against maintaining such prison-like but economically unviable “Jewish areas of residence.”²⁸⁹

Faced by financial problems in late 1937, the Finance Ministry decided to confiscate Jewish property and gave it to the German people.²⁹⁰

“What they [the Jews] faced was an increasingly well-organized though piecemeal state confiscation of assets, made worse by the willingness of tens of thousands of ordinary Germans to exploit the suffering of a disadvantaged minority.”²⁹¹

The bombing of German cities in the Summer of 1941 prompted the Gauleiter of Hamburg, Karl Kaufmann, to ask Hitler if the Jews could be evacuated so as to provide homes for those Germans who had lost their homes in the bombing.²⁹²

“Such arguments helped persuade Hitler that fall to begin deporting Jews during the war instead of waiting for a decisive victory, as had been previously envisioned.”²⁹³

This reasoning was also mentioned at the Wannsee Conference in January 1942.²⁹⁴ I have already covered the starvation of 3.3 million Soviet prisoners of war at the hands of the Germans, so I won’t repeat that here. Needless to say, it was a deliberate policy, and was the prelude to the Holocaust, which came next.²⁹⁵

And I’m not going to go into too much detail here about the Holocaust because I want to cover it in future videos. But note that the economic implosion of the Reich, due to the burden of the social-state which had total control over the economy, had spurred Hitler to wage the war in the first place and begin the Holocaust before the war was won - even though he wanted to wait until after the war before implementing his racial-socialism. By plundering and murdering across Europe, they managed to stave off economic ruin. Like all socialist countries that we’ve ever seen, if they had stayed at home, the Nazi economy would have devoured itself. The reason it didn’t totally implode was because, unlike most other socialist regimes, they conquered other nations, stole their resources, and exported their debts. If this hadn’t have happened, Hitler’s Socialism would probably have collapsed by 1940. Socialism was not just the reason Hitler went to war, but it was also the driving force for the continuation of the war, even beyond the point where winning it was possible, and the driver of the Holocaust.

²⁸⁹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P19-20.

²⁹⁰ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P41.

²⁹¹ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P41.

²⁹² Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P117.

²⁹³ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P117.

²⁹⁴ Aly, "Hitler's Beneficiaries," P117.

²⁹⁵ TIK, "The Fate of Soviet Prisoners of War," <https://youtu.be/OeRR100incE>

Section 7: The Holocaust & Denialism

Socialism is the state control of the means of production. The Holocaust was the state control of the means of destruction. Without Hitler's Socialism you do not get the Holocaust. I have explained this before in previous videos, and it caused a bit of a stir - with some people saying they 'didn't understand it', at the same time that others claimed that it was 'too simple'.

Well, now that I've given you the ideological motivation for the Holocaust - the removal of the Jews from society in order to create a racial collective - and have shown you that the State took over the economy, maybe I can try to explain this again successfully.

Socialism, according to Marx, required "socialized man" to have "common control" (state control). When Hitler used the term: 'socializing the people', he meant the same thing as Marx does here. Both Marx and Hitler wanted to socialize the people. In Marx's case, he wanted them to work together in a one-class (or 'classless') society. In Hitler's case, he wanted to create a one-race society. It's the exact same thing. Of course, some Marxists rejected this, and played dumb when I used the term 'socializing the people', but it's the exact same thing that Marx is saying here. So, with this in mind, I'm going to play you one of my previous videos - "How to Ideologically undermine Holocaust Denialism". This basically presents the idea that denying Hitler's Socialism, whether you realize it or not, is actually denying the Holocaust. And obviously, this is relevant here in this video. So enjoy.²⁹⁶

Hitler wanted to socialize the people into a racial-community (a Volksgemeinshaft) by removing the Jews from society.

The phrase "socializing the people" and the phrase "removing the Jews from society" mean the same thing. They are the same thing. If you deny one, you're denying the other.

Most historians do not understand basic economics; they're simply not trained in economics. They do not understand what socialism is. So they have fallen for the slogans of socialism. They have taken the Marxists at their word when they say Hitler was not a socialist. They have taken the Marxists at their word when they say, Hitler didn't socialise the people (meaning, he didn't remove the Jews from society).

But this is an issue, because the Marxists do say that the Holocaust happened, even though they've just denied the ideological causes for it. They have denied the causes of the Holocaust because they do not want people to understand that Hitler's socialism was REAL socialism. They don't want people to realise that socialism is the murder and theft of the bourgeoisie or the Jews, because people wouldn't support

²⁹⁶ Marx, "Das Kapital v3," P593.

socialism if they understood that socialism is the murder and theft of one group in society for the gain of another. So they simply reject it.

But if Hitler's not a socialist, and did not want to socialise the people by removing the Jews from society in order to make his wonderful People's Community (Volksgemeinshaft), then there is no ideological explanation as to why the Holocaust happened. They've undermined their own argument by distorting the historical truth.

This is why certain countries have resorted to making laws banning Holocaust Denialism, because Marxist-influenced historians cannot combat the argument put forth by the National Socialists, who say that the Holocaust didn't happen. The National Socialists know it happened: they know Hitler was a socialist, and they know he wanted to socialize the people by removing the Jews from society - because that's what they want, a new racial-state. But they deny the Holocaust because to do so is an ideological attack on their Marxist enemies.

What we are witnessing here, ladies and gentlemen, is a Leftist civil war that has been raging for decades. The Marxists want to paint Hitler as being on the Far-Right of the political spectrum, and claim he is a capitalist. The reality is that he was a socialist, and belongs on the Far-Left of the political spectrum. There is little difference between a racial society and a class society - it is the murder and theft of one group in society (the Jews or the Bourgeoisie) for the benefit of another (the Germans or the workers). Socialism is the tyranny of the social group. Capitalism is the freedom and liberty of the individual. But if more people knew this, socialists wouldn't be able to push their socialist agenda.

Well, by denying Hitler's socialism in order to distance Hitler from their own ideology, Marxists have denied the ideological explanation for the Holocaust, allowing National Socialists to deny the Holocaust in turn. What the Holocaust deniers are doing is saying: "look, look, we've found a massive hole in your historical narrative, and you can't plug the gap." They're trolling the Marxists, who should be ashamed that their twisted narrative of history is, in fact, helping to deny the Holocaust.

The reality is that Hitler was a socialist who wanted to socialize the people by removing the Jews from society, and thus the Holocaust happened.

So, when a Holocaust denier says that the Holocaust didn't happen, or that the gas chambers didn't happen, or something like that, all you need to do is question them. Say: "So you're saying Hitler wasn't a socialist?" They'll usually respond in some way shape or form, saying something like "Hitler was a socialist but not a Marxist Socialist" or the like, and that's fine. Follow up with "But, if Hitler didn't murder the Jews, he couldn't have been a socialist or wanted to create a racial-community. I guess he wasn't a REAL National Socialist then, and that National Socialism doesn't promise to build a racial-state."

At that point, enjoy watching them squirm. The foundation of their Holocaust Denialism and their entire National Socialist ideology has been swept away. The rug has been pulled from beneath their feet. They may continue to argue, but you will have them on the backfoot, and any further denialism actually undermines their own argument even more so, to your advantage.

Then you have the Marxist-Socialists who are assisting the National Socialists in their Holocaust denialism, but don't realise it. Simply state that Hitler wanted to socialise the people by removing the Jews from society, and that by denying Hitler's socialism, they're denying the Holocaust. Then when they pull out the "It's not REAL socialism" card, fire back by asking them: "If it's good to murder and steal off the Bourgeoisie, why is it bad to murder and steal off the Jews?" and then ask them "What's the Final Solution to the Bourgeoisie Question? Is it Gulag or Gas Chamber?" Make sure that they are aware that by denying Hitler's socialism, they are denying the Holocaust.

Thus:

Hitler wanted to socialize the people into a racial-community (a Volksgemeinshaft) by removing the Jews from society. Hitler's socialism was his racism.

Denying Hitler's Holocaust, or denying Hitler's socialism, is the same thing. It is denying History.²⁹⁷

²⁹⁷ TIK, "How to Ideologically undermine Holocaust Denialism," <https://youtu.be/qtACBI1Txrc>

Section 8: Other Counterarguments

Part 1: "But the 'Market' Still Existed!"

Despite all the evidence presented here, and in previous videos and books, some Marxists will still claim that none of it matters because, they will say, that the 'market' still existed in Nazi Germany. And thus, because the 'market' still existed, therefore it was capitalism. In fact, you see this line of argument in Neumann's Behemoth, and other such works, all of which are desperately trying to hold onto the idea that it's not socialism.²⁹⁸

Okay, first off, let's just pretend for a second that Nazi Germany had a 'market' economy. As I said earlier in this video, that does not mean that National Socialism was capitalist. The Third Reich economy *'might'* have still been capitalist (which it wasn't, but let's just roll with it), however it's pretty clear that the Nazis were not. They were aiming to conquer 'living space' first to get the resources they needed to implement 'full-socialism'. They *tried* to do that, but failed. So, they *tried* to implement socialism, and failed to do so. That doesn't mean they *weren't* socialists, it just means they're failures. By the same logic, they *tried* to conquer the East, but they *failed*, so I guess they didn't want to conquer the East at all? No, they *did* want to conquer the East, but they *failed* to do so.

So at best you could argue that: Hitler was a Socialist, National Socialism was Socialist, but the Third Reich may not have been. Although I would still argue that it was.

Secondly, what these Marxists are saying here is that a 'market' economy is capitalist. Well, no. That's not the definition of capitalism. Capitalism is the 'free market' - private control of the means of production. So, when the state is in control of the means of production, and manipulates prices and implements wage controls and regulations and so on, even if a businessman still owned the market stall, that wouldn't be capitalism, because the private businessman is not in full-control of his business. In fact, the State has a lot more control than he does. So, all that is required for it to be classed as socialism is the control of the market by the State, not the market's abolishment. Abolishment might be a requirement for Marxism, but it isn't for Socialism.

Finally, a black market is a free market. It's outside of State control - thus a black market businessman is free to fulfill the needs of his customers (obviously he is restricted by the operation of the State's economy, but at least he's being not directly controlled by it). And when you have a black market, you know that the rest of the economy has to be state-controlled (socialist) - otherwise it would not be possible to have a black free market in the first place. The black market is a capitalist free market. And yes, there was a black market in Nazi Germany, just like there was a black market in the Soviet Union, and North Korea, and the UK and the United States right now. And those black markets are capitalist markets. But the reality is that the State has control of the rest of the economy (at least in

²⁹⁸ Neumann, "Behemoth," P313.

part), and that's why the black market exists. The 'official' economy, is the state-economy. It is the socialist economy. Taxation is state control. Regulation is state control. Law, when made by the state, is state control. State control of the economy is socialism.

'But all counties have states that control their economies, so are you saying that all states in the world right now are socialist?'

Think. If the state controls the economy, the 'private' individual has no control. The state may not have total control - they may not be totalitarian - but they have a lot of control. You, the private individual, are not in control of your own economy if you're forced to hand over your wealth to the state in the form of taxation. And if you - the private citizen - are not in control, it's not capitalism. If you own a house, try not paying your public taxes and see how long you retain ownership of your 'private' property. You won't, because it's not actually private property, it's owned by the State.

If you do not have a choice, you are not free, if you are not free, you are a slave. Do you have a choice to pay taxes or not? No - you have to pay taxes. Then you have no choice, and you are not free. If you have to submit to the collective, then you are a slave.

And, in reality, we've never actually had capitalism, because we've never actually had a truly free market. We have been close - Britain was the closest in the late 1800s - but not close enough. And then the Liberal Party of Britain decided to turn away from more free market economics and embraced socialism in the late 1870s and early 1880s. And Britain has not had a free market party since then.²⁹⁹ Elements of our economies are capitalist - the black market, and the cash-in-hand, no-questions-asked 'gig' economy - but the fact that people are having to dodge the taxman and the regulator in the first place, plus the fact that the State can seize you and your property at any time it wants, is an indication that the private individual has little freedom. And without freedom - without a free market - you do not have capitalism.

Totalitarians will disagree with this because they want power. But the definitions are clear. If the individual has to submit to the collective, then it is no longer capitalism. This is why the enemy of freedom is the State.

"...when I see an actual flesh-and-blood worker in conflict with his natural enemy, the policeman, I do not have to ask myself which side I am on."³⁰⁰

Part 2: The "Hitler Killed Ernst Röhm" Fallacy

Another counter argument against the idea that National Socialism was *real* National Socialism is the "Hitler Killed Ernst Röhm" fallacy. This claim, made by Marxist Romancers, states that Hitler killed a socialist, *therefore*, they say, this proves that Hitler wasn't a

²⁹⁹ Weller, "The New Liberalism," P29-47.

³⁰⁰ Orwell, "Homage to Catalonia," P104.

socialist. Well, not only does this argument fall flat in the face of logic, but it's also a fundamental misreading of the historical situation.

Even if you didn't know the history, let's think about this for a second. The logic is, okay Hitler kills Ernst Röhm, and since Ernst Röhm is a socialist, and Hitler kills him, this proves that Hitler *can't* be a socialist. You know, because Lenin didn't kill Mensheviks, or Stalin didn't commit the Purges or anything. Are they not socialist either? Are the Americans who killed other Americans in the American Civil War not Americans? If a soldier kills another soldier, is he not a soldier?

Also, Hitler killed Ernst Röhm, and Ernst Röhm was a German. I guess Hitler's doesn't like Germans either. And Hitler killed Ernst Röhm, and Ernst Röhm was a male, so by that logic, Hitler's a woman. I mean, what kind of logic is this?

Also, if Hitler was a capitalist, and the National Socialist Party was capitalist, which is what the Marxists claim, why on Earth was there a socialist in the capitalist party in the first place? And why was this socialist in charge of the paramilitary army of three-million socialists - the SA? Surely, Hitler wouldn't have been so stupid as to put a socialist in charge of three-million socialist semi-soldiers if he was a capitalist?

So, even without knowing the historical context, you can tell that *something* is wrong with this argument.

Then you start to fill in the gaps. Hitler killed Ernst Röhm, as well as up to one-thousand others on the same night - the Night of the Long Knives. Really? Why did Hitler not kill all three-million socialists? They're right there, and he knows who they are. So he may as well murder all of them at the same time. Right? But no, he only kills one-thousand of them.

Worse, of the one-thousand people Hitler does kill, some of them weren't Socialists. Hitler kills von Papen's associates, and places Papen himself under house arrest. Papen is a conservative, a Catholic, and someone who enacted numerous "capitalistic" policies in the economy. These included Article 48 in 1932, which reduced unemployment payments, lowered wages, gave tax cuts to the rich, and more. So, Hitler purges him from power as well (although doesn't kill him). Is that because Hitler's also not a conservative or a capitalist either? Because by the same logic that says Hitler killing a socialist 'proves' that he wasn't a socialist, then Hitler purging a capitalist 'proves' that Hitler wasn't a capitalist either. Clearly, the Marxist argument is false.

In reality, Hitler believed that Ernst Röhm was (supposedly) planning a coup against him, so therefore he needed to take him out. He also wanted to remove other opposition to his rule as well, and it gave him the opportunity of securing army support. So this was Hitler consolidating his power, rather than him defeating socialists.

And yes it is true, Ernst Röhm was a socialist. But Ernst Röhm was an old-fashioned socialist who called for complete state-ownership of the economy. He also believed in a *violent* revolution, rather than a more 'peaceful' revolution which Hitler had called for. Hitler

had tried the violent-revolution route in 1923 and had failed, and so went the peaceful-democratic route in 1933. He even boasted that not a single window pane had been smashed during his revolution.³⁰¹

"That was the most unbloody revolution in history."³⁰²

What was actually happening was that the SA wanted violence, and Ernst Röhm, an old-revolutionary, wanted violence as well. But Hitler, being a new-revolutionary, didn't see violence in the take-over period as necessary. He wanted a revolution from above - a state-planned revolution - rather than a revolution from below, like Röhm wanted. Marxist historians have claimed that Röhm was 'revolutionary', while Hitler was 'reactionary', and they claimed that Röhm was Left-wing, and Hitler was Right-wing, but this is a massive misinterpretation of the events.³⁰³

"The conflict between Hitler and Röhm was not a conflict between reaction and revolution, but more between the representatives of different models of revolution. The historian H. Mau probably gave the clearest description by saying that the conflict was between 'a revolution of the old school' (Röhm) and a representative of 'modern revolution' (Hitler)."³⁰⁴

The SS were also part of the SA during this time. The SS then branched away from the SA and became more dominant later. So, if the SA was the 'socialist branch' of the Nazi Party, as Marxists claim, then why would the SS not also be socialist? The SS went on to dominate the Third Reich later on, so why would this be an indication that the Third Reich was capitalist? I don't see how the downfall of one socialist-organization and the growth of another socialist-organization would somehow indicate capitalism.³⁰⁵

Thus, like many claims from the Marxist-side, the "Hitler Killed Ernst Röhm" Fallacy simply doesn't hold up to scrutiny. The whole thing has been misrepresented to push their ideological agenda that somehow Hitler was a capitalist, a right-winger, or a conservative, or whatever. This is an absolute distortion of history, and those pushing it rightly deserve to be called out for it.

Part 3: Whataboutism

There are other arguments against the idea that Hitler's Socialism wasn't *real* Socialism, but they don't stand up to scrutiny, and it is possible to use the evidence that I've shown so far in this video to tackle them.

However, when Marxists lose arguments, they resort to devious and dishonest tactics in order to try and claim some sort of moral victory. These pointless arguments that they bring

³⁰¹ Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P72-92.

³⁰² Hitler to Hans Frank, 30 Jan 1933, from Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P70.

³⁰³ Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P70-87.

³⁰⁴ Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P85.

³⁰⁵ Zitelmann, "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction," P85.

up aren't really related to National Socialism being Socialism, but are simply designed as a way to claim a 'gotcha'-victory for them. The idea goes like this - you create a great argument that explains why Hitler had to be a socialist, you provide substantially more evidence than your opponents (if they bring any evidence to the table at all), and you completely destroy their counterarguments. But, because they're blinded by their unwavering faith in socialism (thinking they're morally righteous), they can't admit defeat, or admit that something might be wrong with their argument. Instead, they'll say something like - "What about the poor?" "What about health care?" "What about a fair wage?" "What about this, what about that?" "What about Pinochet?" "What about great socialist countries like Sweden?" "Who's going to build the roads?" "No man is an island!" "We've got to cooperate together somehow!" "We've got to help the lazy!" "We've got to solve the great made-up crisis of our generation!" "Who's going to fail to catch criminals if there's no road pirates?" "Capitalism is evil!" "Capitalists are greedy!" "Capitalism has killed more than socialism!" "Coca-Cola Death Squads!"

None of these arguments are relevant to begin with, nor are they a counterargument to the main point I'm making: that Hitler was a Socialist.

I'm not going to go through them all, but again, none of these actually stand up to scrutiny. To take but one example, Pinochet supposedly brought in capitalism. Except, he didn't. The fact that he's a dictator, that taxes were still forcefully collected rather than volunteered, and the fact that there was a state army - should be proof enough. Yes, he supposedly 'privatized' parts of the economy - but since 'privatization' can still mean that the State is in control of the economy somehow (like in Hitler's regime), I highly doubt he did any actual 'privatization' at all. He never created a gold standard. The world central banks lent vast sums of currency to his regime, and the corporations blossomed... None of that is capitalism.

But even if he was a capitalist, great. That's not an argument against Hitler being a socialist. Even if you somehow proved that 'Capitalism was evil' (which it isn't), great: Hitler's still a socialist. Even if you somehow convinced me that the National Socialist Health Service in the UK is actually not a giant waste of money that's an economic leech upon society, great: Hitler's still a socialist.

I don't agree with any of these Aboutisms, but even if I did agree, they're not relevant. So, stop bringing them up, and start realising that there's substantial evidence pointing in one direction - that Hitler was a Socialist. That's what's relevant. None of these aboutsims are relevant. Bringing these up is an intellectually dishonest tactic designed purely to distract us from the fact that you've lost the argument. So stick to the topic, go away and come back with more evidence, better interpretation, and a solid argument. And if you can't do that, then just admit you've been defeated.

Part 4: "Historians Don't Agree with TIK"

One of the counterarguments I've received states that 'every' historian disagrees with me. Thus, I must be wrong, or insane. Because (as we all know) a consensus is all that matters. Everyone believes that the moon is made of cheese, therefore the moon is made of cheese. Don't you dare question the consensus.

Clearly, that logic doesn't work. But yes, they are correct that a lot of historians write books on the Third Reich that are full of examples of Hitler's socialism, but which conclude that Hitler's not a socialist. I have great respect for some of these historians, like Richard Evans, who has written a great book on history theory (which I mostly agree with), and was one of the historians who took part in the Irving vs Penguin Books Trial. He's also written many great books on the Third Reich, such as "The Coming of the Third Reich", which is jammed full of examples of Hitler's socialism.

The problem is that, after pages and pages of examples of state-control of the means of production, or collective control of the means of production, Richard Evans then concludes -

"Despite the change of name, however, it would be wrong to see Nazism as a form of, or an outgrowth from, socialism. True, as some have pointed out, its rhetoric was frequently egalitarian, it stressed the need to put common needs above the needs of the individual, and it often declared itself opposed to big business and international finance capital. Famously, too, antisemitism was once declared to be 'the socialism of fools'. But from the very beginning, Hitler declared himself implacably opposed to Social Democracy [which isn't Socialism] and, initially to a much smaller extent, Communism [that's Marxism, not Socialism]: after all, the 'November traitors' who had signed the Armistice and later the Treaty of Versailles were not Communists at all, but the Social Democrats and their allies."³⁰⁶

Again, nothing to do with Socialism.

"The 'National Socialists' wanted to unite the two political camps of left and right into which, they argued, the Jews had manipulated the German nation. The basis for this was to be the idea of race. This was light years removed from the class-based ideology of socialism."³⁰⁷

No, Socialism has nothing to do with Class. When he says the term 'Socialism', what Evans is actually referring to is Marxism, which isn't Socialism, but a variant of it. So clearly, he doesn't know the terms properly. He doesn't know the definition of Socialism. But he does go on -

"Nazism was in some ways an extreme counter-ideology to socialism, [again, he means Marxism] borrowing much of its rhetoric in the process, from its self-image as a movement rather than a party, to its much-vaunted contempt for bourgeois convention and conservative timidity. The idea of a 'party' suggested allegiance to parliamentary democracy, working steadily within a settled democratic polity. In

³⁰⁶ Evans, "The Coming of the Third Reich," Chapter 3. The Rise of Nazism (Kindle).

³⁰⁷ Evans, "The Coming of the Third Reich," Chapter 3. The Rise of Nazism (Kindle).

speeches and propaganda, however, Hitler and his followers preferred on the whole to talk of the 'National Socialist movement', just as the Social Democrats had talked of the 'worker's movement' or, come to that, the feminists of the 'women's movement' and the apostles of prewar teenage rebellion of the 'youth movement'.³⁰⁸

So again, Hitler is anti-democratic, not anti-Socialist. And also, being hostile to the Social Democrats does not mean that he's hostile to Socialism. The Marxists in the Communist Party were also hostile to the Social Democrats, which is why they were in a different party. But I don't hear many people saying that they're not *real* Socialists.

The reality is that Evans, unfortunately, doesn't know the definition of 'Socialism'. He knows what Marxism is, but hasn't recognized that Marxism is a version of Socialism. 'Socialism' predates 'Marxism'. It's state-control in the name of the workers. National Socialism is state-control in the name of the race. Fascism is state-control in the name of the nation. Feminist-Socialism is state-control in the name of the women. But they're all Socialism. They're all state-control. That does not mean that Marxism is the *only* version of Socialism. It's not. But Evans thinks that it is. And this is where he's going wrong. He spends something like 95% of his books on the Third Reich talking about how the Nazis wanted and gained state-control, and then used that state-control of the economy to achieve their ends. Yet, he still concludes that it's not Socialism. And to be clear, I think Evans is a great historian, but he's got this element wrong and it is hurting his view of the Third Reich.

And this is what all the other authors are doing. They're providing me with tons of evidence of state-control of the means of production in Nazi Germany, and I'm happy to use their evidence. I just disagree with their conclusions that it's 'capitalism', and the reason why is because I actually know the historical definition of the term 'socialism'.

Tooze is another example. What's frustrating is that I've had socialists claim that I haven't read Tooze, and I therefore need to go back and read him. And they say that because supposedly Tooze 'proves' that the Third Reich was capitalist. Well, no he doesn't. Again, I've quoted quite heavily from Tooze, and his books are filled with instances of the Third Reich being socialist. He gives plenty of evidence of socialism. But then concludes that it's not *real* Socialism. And he does this because he doesn't know what socialism is, and (again) thinks Marxism is socialism. So he comes to the false conclusion that the economy was capitalist. This is why I've been very critical of him in the past. It's blatantly obvious that the National Socialists implemented collective public state control of the economy, and when I read Tooze all I'm seeing is collective state control of the economy, but somehow he says that it's capitalism. I mean, talk about falling at the final hurdle.

Many of the other historians who say it's not socialism make the exact same error. They list tons of examples of socialism, and then conclude that it's capitalism. I'm using their evidence, but coming to a different conclusion, because I've done my homework into the actual definitions of the terms, and I know the difference between Marxism and Socialism. So, when these people counter argue that 'every' historian disagrees with me, it's not

³⁰⁸ Evans, "The Coming of the Third Reich," Chapter 3. The Rise of Nazism (Kindle).

actually true. The evidence that the historians are providing agrees with my interpretation, and, ironically, it doesn't agree with their own interpretation. If these historians understood the actual definition of socialism, they would realize their interpretation was incorrect, but that their evidence is correct.

Not only that, but not 'every' historian disagrees with me. There's a few out there who do agree with me, or at least, do not agree with the consensus that Hitler and National Socialism were capitalism. Zitelmann thinks it's a socialist-like 'third way' between Marxism and Capitalism. Alan Brown in "How 'socialist' was National Socialism?" also concludes that it's socialism. Götz Aly has an entire section in his absolutely awesome book, Hitler's Beneficiaries, titled "Nazi Socialism". There's von Kuehneit-Leddihn, born in 1919 as the son of a scientist, who had a Masters in Economics and a Doctorate in Political Science. His text "Leftism: From de Sade and Marx to Hitler and Marcuse" paints the Nazis as socialist. When talking about the invasion of the East, Timothy Snyder says -

"Socialism in one country would be supplanted by socialism for the German race."³⁰⁹

And there are more besides, but you get the idea. So, not only are there historians that have come to the same conclusion I have, or similar, but the evidence provided by those who don't accept my view, actually supports the idea that Hitler's Socialism was Socialism, than it does that Hitler's Socialism was Capitalism. Not that a consensus matters anyway. Even if everyone disagreed with me, that doesn't mean I'm wrong. All that matters is the evidence and interpretation, and I think I have the superior argument here.

Part 5: TIK vs Academia

Another counter argument says that I'm pushing a 'conspiracy theory' that academia has been infiltrated with 'progressives' who are deliberately miseducating the youth. They're also saying that this 'conspiracy theory' has no basis in reality.

The problem is that, as I've just shown in the previous section, there's quite a few academic historians who are presenting a ton of evidence of Hitler's Socialism, but are then concluding that it's 'capitalism'. How do we account for that? What's their excuse? You're telling me that not one of them has looked into the definitions of the words they use, and completely ignored all the evidence that they present in their own books that is blatantly leading them to the opposite conclusion? You're telling me that not one of them, in the past eighty years, has actually read Mein Kampf, or Hitler's unpublished Second Book, or his speeches, or his table talks? Because it's pretty damn obvious that they missed most of it out.

Eighty-years after the end of the war, we should *not* be debating whether National Socialism really was National Socialism or not. They say it's nationalism, not socialism. But that's the same thing. A nation is a society, is it not? What's the difference between the 'nationalisation of the means of production' and the 'socialisation of the means of production'? Nothing. The

³⁰⁹ Snyder, "Blood Lands," P163.

fact that these historians of the Third Reich are still concluding that socialism was capitalism, is just unfathomable.

So, how do we account for this? What possible explanation can there be?

Well, let's look at the evidence. I, for one, was taught a very Keynesian and Marxist-Socialist version of history when I was at college and university in the UK. The vast majority of the history books I have read, also present a very Keynesian and Marxist-Socialist version of history. A lot of people are saying the same thing - that they were taught the Marxist-interpretation of history, and that the majority of the books are written by 'progressives' and Socialists (which they are).

Let's not forget that socialism is popular amongst the economically illiterate - which most people, and most historians, are. Let's not forget that the majority of people are taught in state-controlled schools, which don't teach you how economics works, or what money is, or what currency is, or anything related to the real world. Let's not forget that academic historians go through the state school system, then through the state-funded corporations which we call college and university, and end up working in the 'safe-spaces' of the same system which taught them. (And yes, if student loans are provided by the state, then these places are state-funded.)

So, straight away, at the very least, that's a feedback loop. They've not experienced what it's like to work in the real world - the market. Most of them have never started a business or done anything practical - they're living entirely in their heads. Rationalism. Worse, they must conform to the standards set by the hierarchy that they've been taught to obey from birth (which is actually the reason the state-school system was established in the first place, to get you to obey your teachers, and the authorities), otherwise, if they don't obey, they'll be cast out into the scary real-world.

This is, in fact, an argument that I had with my tutors when I attended university. They were trying to give me career advice. And I told them straight - you're not living in the real world, and the advice you're giving out is incorrect. They're not entrepreneurs; they don't understand how businesses work - they don't even know how the market works. Even when we look at the business-professors at university, most of them have never set up businesses themselves. They work for the hierarchy of the university, and the university gives them students. They don't have to attract them. They're not answerable to the students. They're not accountable directly to the consumer, and thus have no incentive to do a good job.

They have little or no economic experience. That's why they don't teach you what money is - they have no idea what it is! If you think paper notes are money, you're wrong.

The point of intelligence is to question, discuss and, through a process of arguing back and forth, reach a conclusion which is close to the truth. You can't do any of that in our current 'education' system. In theory, universities are meant to be places where you can come out with the most blatantly controversial views, and then scrutinize them. But that's not allowed in the current miseducation system. You must obey your teachers, and you can't say

anything that may 'offend' someone else. If you do 'offend' someone, you'll be excommunicated. Don't clap, because the loud noise is offensive to my ears; instead click your fingers, because somehow that's acceptable now. And you think I'm joking - go look it up. It's a thing! Right! Apparently, clapping and clicking has now been replaced by 'jazz-hands'. Just what?³¹⁰

"The University of Glasgow started issuing "trigger warnings" for theology students studying the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, whereby students are told they may see distressing images and are given the opportunity to leave."³¹¹

Yeah, there's definitely nothing wrong with these universities. Nothing wrong with the academics teaching at these institutions at all.

"[Liverpool] University bans litter pickers after snowflake students find them 'stressful'."³¹²

Why would you give into this? Why? What's wrong with the people who work at these state corporations?

"SpongeBob Squarepants Is A 'Violent,' 'Racist' Colonizer, College Professor Says."
³¹³

"...there is an absence of public discourse about the whitewashing of violent American military activities through SpongeBob's occupation and reclaiming of the bottom of Bikini Atoll's lagoon. SpongeBob Squarepants and his friends play a role in normalizing the settler colonial takings of indigenous lands while erasing the ancestral Bikinian people from their nonfictional homeland."³¹⁴

Gee, I wonder why academic historians think Hitler is a capitalist? Oh that's right, it's because they also think SpongeBob is as bad as Hitler.

"UK Student Kicked Out of Class for Saying 'There Are 2 Genders' Has Now Been Expelled."³¹⁵

³¹⁰

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/10/02/clapping-replaced-jazz-hands-student-union-amid-fears-noise/>

³¹¹

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/10/02/clapping-replaced-jazz-hands-student-union-amid-fears-noise/>

³¹² <https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/7475551/snowflake-students-get-litter-squad-banned/>

³¹³ Timcast, "Woke Professor SLAMS SpongeBob Squarepants As Racist Colonizer, THIS CANT BE REAL," <https://youtu.be/0CQSQkO0ZQU>

³¹⁴ Barker, University of Hawaii, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/734722>

³¹⁵

<https://www1.cbn.com/cbnnews/world/2019/july/uk-student-who-was-kicked-out-of-class-for-saying-there-are-2-genders-will-not-return-to-school-nnbsp>

Right, whether we agree with the student or not, an education system is meant to be the place where you can have this debate. Shutting down the debate is intellectually dishonest. It's censorship. Instead of tackling the argument - which, I mean, if the argument isn't true then it should be easy to tackle it, but apparently not, right? Instead of doing that, these academics decided to remove the student. Effectively then, they're admitting that they can't defeat his argument, so they're doing what Stalin did - removing the problem. No man, no problem.

Well, you can't have a debate in this sort of environment. An argument, by its very nature, is a contest between two sides. It is offensive - it's meant to be. And these snowflake professors have ruined the idea of having a debate, supposedly because you're not allowed to 'offend' anyone.

Well, here's the killer. The only way to calculate the true value of an argument is to exchange ideas back and forth, debating them, arguing them out, until one argument eventually wins over the other. And without the free exchange of ideas, without the arguing back and forth, it is impossible to assess the true value of an argument. We have the facts - we know World War Two happened - but we also have to interpret it. When was the turning point of World War Two? The facts don't tell us. Therefore we must debate it.

If we all agree, then we have no debate, so we have no way to know when it comes to interpreting things if we're right or wrong. Unless we've previously had a debate on the subject and come to a conclusion, then we must debate it in order to know if what we believe is right or wrong. It is impossible to assess the value of a consensus which was not formed through the process of a debate - the free and honest exchange of ideas. Which is why history lies in the heart of the debate. If everyone believes that the sun goes around the Earth, then we're wrong. If one guy stands up and says - 'wait a second, that's incorrect' - what are we to do, just censor him? '*No no, we believe that the Earth is in the center of the universe, and look, even this high priest said it was, so there you go see, 'proof'!*'

Now, these university professors who prevent arguments from happening, and uphold 'political correctness', are censoring the debate. Therefore, there's no way for them to calculate the true value of their arguments. They're in a bubble of their own ignorance. This is why they're coming out with ridiculous conclusions, or stupid rules, and if anyone challenges them, then they shut down the debate. '*You're sexist, your racist, you're this, you're that.*' The reality is that they don't want the debate, because their faith in their ideology is all that matters. It's the exact same reason why you couldn't trust anything that came out of the Soviet Union. They weren't allowed to question anything, so there was no debate. Without the free exchange of ideas, there was no way to know if what was said was true or false. So, the official line was completely valueless.

And can the historians in our universities really have a true debate? I don't think so. They must not rock the boat, or they will lose their jobs. If there's a few who actually agree with me, I don't know if they could actually say it. If they said that Hitler was a Socialist, and people got 'offended' - which is what happened the first time I said it - then the university would get rid of them. Damage control. It's not about the truth, or the debate, or the

education - it's about keeping the hierarchy of the education corporation intact. So academic historians, who work in public institutions (so, non-private places), cannot have a true debate. And this is leading them to false conclusions.

Now, let's assume you've got to this point in the video, and you don't agree with me at all. Fine. But I guarantee that this video has been beneficial to you. It will, at the very least, have allowed you to compare your own argument to mine, thus giving you an understanding of the opposite view of the argument, and, assuming you're being honest with yourself and actually paid attention, it will have strengthened your own line of reasoning in preparation for an intellectually honest counterargument. Therefore, even if you don't agree with me at all, this video will still have been useful to you, even if it only confirmed what you previously knew. If I get defeated here - if someone comes along with a very good counter argument that defeats mine properly - then great! We've all learned! And if I'm right, great! We've all learned again!

But if we don't have the debate, because it's artificially shut down, or people complain so much that it persuades people not to take me seriously, we can't learn. We can't find the truth. So we will live in ignorance of the truth. It is therefore in all our best interests to have a debate about this subject.

But if the academics (or corporations like 'YouTube', or the central State) are not allowing the debate, or somehow find a way to call this 'offensive' and take it down, then we won't learn, and we will have a valueless interpretation of the Third Reich, since you cannot calculate the value of an argument without the debate.

And I think there's only a few options here with regard to why the academics do not believe Hitler's Socialism was Socialism. There's either, mass-ignorance amongst the academic historians regarding the actual definition of socialism, which is unlikely after two-hundred years since socialism's birth; or they're all Statists themselves and don't want to admit it, which is more likely, since socialism appeals to those rationalists living outside the real world, and we have evidence of social-progressivism inside the universities (but then this is where the - "TIK believes in conspiracy theories" - piece comes into play), and also the fact that they are recruited by the state, they're funded by the state, it's in their interest to promote the state; or a lot of them know that National Socialism was socialism, but can't say anything because they're fearing for their jobs if they came out and said it. This last scenario is also highly likely, and would explain a lot of things. They're presenting all this evidence in the books that says that Hitler's Socialism was Socialism, but then concluding that it's Capitalism. Maybe they do know the truth, but can't come out and say it yet. Maybe it's a big in-joke. Maybe they're taunting each other saying - '*hey guys, look at all this socialism. Are you going to be the one to stick your neck out first and say what it is? Go on, I dare you.*' - sort of thing.

But some academic historians, and non-academic historians, have stuck their neck out, and have said Hitler's Socialism was Socialism. There's also others that have rejected the 'Hitler's Capitalism' idea, even if they haven't accepted the Socialism bit. So there's definitely some out there who have thought this through. But the majority of the academics appear to

fall into these three camps - mass-ignorance of the definitions, they're socialists, or they just can't say it. Given the fact that I've been through the miseducation system, and have been taught the Marxist and Keynesian view of history, and the fact that there's other people saying that they were taught the same, and the fact that many universities in the west are currently snowflake cities, plus the fact that they're able to present all this evidence of socialism and yet still conclude that it's capitalism (so, their reasoning is doubleplus ungood), I'm favouring the argument that says "they're socialists".

But maybe I'm wrong. Maybe it's just mass-ignorance. However, whatever the reason is, the majority of the academic historians are at fault for still pushing the untruth that Hitler's Socialism was capitalism. And they're at fault for embracing socialism and Keynesianism, and then pushing these debunked anti-economic theories upon their students. And this isn't a 'conspiracy', as such. It's just that academics are a product of their own schooling. Well, there's a difference between 'school' and 'education'. They're not the same thing. And these academics are somehow able to read the sources and completely miss what is staring them in the face. How they've done that for eighty-years is anyone's guess. But either way, I have a critical view of state-educated tax-funded student-fleecing universities for this reason.

And yes, despite some people not believing it, for some reason - I do have a degree in history, and I was ignorant as well, until recently. But my degree - as are many others - is worth less than the paper it was written on. It certainly wasn't worth the student loan debt. Luckily, I managed to snap out of the ignorant trance that my miseducation had left over me. I just hope many other debt-slaves - sorry, students - can do the same.

Part 6: "TIK is Mentally ill"

Yes, this is actually a counter argument that people have brought up as a way of 'debunking' me.

So yes, I'm going to have some fun with this one.

'Look guys, I'm completely insane, yet somehow I don't believe in a system of economics that has failed spectacularly every time it was implemented.'

'You know, the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over in the hope you get different results. Well, that's socialism in a nutshell.'

There's actually a few variations of this. Some Marxists have argued that the reason I'm coming up with (what they deem to be) 'wrong arguments' is because I'm 'tired' and need a break. Or that I'm having 'personal troubles'. Or I'm 'working too hard'. Or I have 'mental health issues'.

We call this 'gaslighting'. Which is to -

"Manipulate (someone) by psychological means into doubting their own sanity."³¹⁶

Of course, such arguments are designed to undermine my legitimacy in the eyes of others, and cause me to doubt myself. Essentially it's slander, a personal attack, and technically abuse as well. And I don't see YouTube doing anything about it - oh that's right, because they're on their side. Once again, some Marxists called for me to commit suicide - to neck myself - and then tried to deny that they ever said this.

Ultimately though, these arguments don't work. Even if I was insane, the argument I'm presenting still stands. Why is it that these Marxists can't defeat the argument, and instead resort to smearing, slandering and gaslighting? Are they not as intelligent as an insane man?

Rather than take on my argument, they focus on me - the author. Once again, it is a dishonest tactic. If my evidence and my interpretation were truly as bad as they claim, then they should have no trouble showing how my arguments are flawed, and convince me that they are flawed as well. If it's as obvious as they claim, then this should be easy to do. And yet, every time they've done this, I've been left unconvinced - as have many others.

The real problem here is that their counter arguments don't work. I'm not convinced by them, and, as I have done throughout this video, I can take them apart and show them why they don't work. The only way that their version of events would make sense is if the definitions of capitalism and socialism are not what they were historically (and thus were the contradictory definitions that the Marxists use), and if the Holocaust didn't happen. I'm not willing to accept such arguments.

But I have a question for you - is paranoia insanity? One of the counterarguments that the Marxists developed quite quickly was the conspiracy theory that I'm only saying Hitler is a Socialist to attack their ideology - Marxism. They're the ones believing that I secretly planned an attack against their ideology - despite the evidence to the contrary, I might add. My first video on National Socialism being Socialism was directed solely against the National Socialists themselves, which is why I was completely shocked and unprepared for the backlash - not from the Nazis - but from their allies, the Marxists, who flooded my channel (and still do) making stupid remarks and screaming at me in the comment section like babies. If I had known that my main opposition was going to be the Marxists, I would have designed the video differently, so that I was fully prepared for the Marxist backlash, like I am now. But the video was designed to tackle to Nazis, and I found myself then facing a hostile ally of the Nazis, who came to their rescue, which I wasn't expecting. Yes, the National Socialists and the Inter-National Socialists were united in their opposition of me... but they're not *real* socialists or anything.

And I'm not really interested in tackling Marxism for its own sake. It's not worth arguing against something that fails so consistently. I'm only having to do so because they're so adamant in defending the Nazis, and on denying history in the comment sections of my history videos. If you're denying the Socialism of National Socialism, you're denying the

³¹⁶ <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/gaslight>

Holocaust. So, it's not necessarily anti-Marxism which is driving me to make these videos, but Marxist Holocaust Denialism. It just so happens that the arguments that I need to use against the Nazis, happen to be the same arguments that also defeat the Marxists. If I'm fighting against the collective totalitarianism of Fascism and National Socialism, then I'm also fighting against the collective totalitarianism of Marxist Socialism, and Socialism in general. There's a crossover, but the focus is not exclusively against the Marxists.

However, now that I've had such a backlash from a bunch of spoilt, ungrateful, and screaming Marxists, who are hostile to history and are smearing and slandering away, I have since that time developed a take-no-prisoners attitude towards them. If I'm being unjustifiably attacked by a hostile horde of regressive snowflakes, asking me to 'neck' myself, then I'm not going to sit here passively. I'm going to strike back, which is what I have done, and what I will continue to do.

The real reason the collective relies upon these tactics of abuse though is because they have nothing left. They have no *actual* counter-argument to what I'm saying. In their responses to me, many of them refuse to answer my own questions. I proposed several questions in the Shrinking Markets video. I asked, how did the Free Market result in the Holocaust? I asked, which private business owned and marketed the Holocaust? And I asked, how is 100% taxation a fair wage? Yet, in their responses, they completely ignored these questions, and in one case, pretended they didn't understand the questions.

Ultimately, when you know the enemy and you know yourself, you need not fear the result of a thousand battles. I know the Marxist arguments, economics and policies. I understand them, and I can see the flaws. That's not insanity - that's intelligence, which is why it may seem so alien to them.

Section 9: Conclusion & Summary

Despite what some believe, Socialism is the collective public-sector state control of the means of production. You cannot have totalitarianism without socialism - total state-control of the economy.

Hitler wanted to create a version of Socialism for the race, which would exclude the Jews, but end the class conflict and unite the German people. He believed in the Marxist and Socialist concept of the Shrinking Markets, which he thought would bring down civilisation within a few years. So, wanting to 'save the world', Hitler embarked on a crusade to the East, for the living space and resources he needed to implement his full-socialism. In the meantime, a limited socialism would be implemented. But, due to the fact that socialism doesn't work, this caused the economy of the Third Reich to stutter and implode, forcing Hitler to go to war in the late 1930s. This allowed the Germans to steal the resources from conquered Europe and export the inflation that would have crippled their economy to other countries.

Due to the fact that Germany lost the war in the East, Hitler was unable to implement his full-socialism. However, that does not mean he wasn't socialist. Failing to implement socialism doesn't mean he was a capitalist. Even if the Third Reich still had a 'market' economy (which it didn't) or used money and wanted profit (which Marxists claim makes it capitalist), that still does not mean that Hitler or the National Socialists were capitalists. They were socialists who were trying to implement socialism. They failed to do so, and, much like Lenin and Stalin failed to bring in *real* Socialism in their country, this just makes them failures, not capitalists.

National Socialism was left-wing Socialism. Hitler was a Socialist, believing in the Race Theory of History, rather than the Class Theory of History that the Marxists believe in. Hitler also brought about a 'peaceful revolution' in Germany - one of the first socialists to get elected legitimately rather than through violent revolution - and World War Two should be seen primarily as a Socialist Civil War, making Marxism and the Western semi-socialist states the victors of the conflict.

For eighty-years, academics have failed to see the blatantly obvious. They have denied Hitler's Socialism whilst presenting clear evidence of his Socialism. Their reasoning for doing so remains uncertain, but they as a whole are at fault for this massive error. Thankfully some historians are standing up against the collective consensus, and are engaging in valuable debate. Zitelmann is one such historian - probably my favourite of this subject - who has read the primary sources carefully and correctly, but there are many others. And I'm also willing to stick my neck out and argue for the truth.

Without debate, you do not have history. One collective consensus cannot produce a debate. You cannot judge the value of an argument without another to compare it to, since there is no alternative argument to value it against. Without the free exchange of ideas

between individuals, you do not have value, without value you do not have history. History lies in the heart of the debate. A consensus is not history. Individuals make history. Collectives cannot.

BIBLIOGRAPHY / SOURCES

- Aly, G. "Hitler's Beneficiaries: How the Nazis Bought the German People." Verso, 2016. (Original German 2005).
- Barkai, A. "Nazi Economics: Ideology, Theory, and Policy." Yale University Press, 1990.
- Bel, G. "Against the mainstream: Nazi privatization in 1930s Germany." Universitat de Barcelona, PDF.
- Berkoff, K. "Harvest of Despair: Life and Death in Ukraine under Nazi Rule." Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Birchall, I. "The Spectre of Babeuf." Haymarket Books, 2016.
- Bormann, M. "Hitler's Table Talk." Ostara Publications, 2016.
- Bosworth, R. "Mussolini's Italy: Life under the Dictatorship 1915-1945." Penguin Books, Kindle 2006.
- Brown, A. "How 'socialist' was National Socialism?" Kindle, 2015.
- Colingham, L. "The Taste of War: World War Two and the Battle for Food." Penguin UK, 2011.
- Dilorenzo, T. "The Problem with Socialism." Regnery Publishing, Kindle 2016.
- Engels, F "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific." Written, 1880. Progress Publishers, 1970.
- Engelstein, L. "Russia in Flames: War, Revolution, Civil War, 1914-1921." Oxford University Press, Kindle 2018.
- Evans, R. "The Coming of the Third Reich." Penguin Books, Kindle 2004.
- Farrell, N. "Mussolini: A New Life." Endeavour Press Ltd, Kinde 2015.
- Feder, G. "The Programme of the NSDAP: The National Socialist German Worker's Party and its General Conceptions." RJJ Enterprises Inc, 2003.
- Feder, G. "The German State on a National and Socialist Foundation." Black House Publishing LTD, 2015.
- Friedman, M. "Capitalism and Freedom: Fortieth Anniversary Edition." university of Chicago, Kindle 2002. (originally published in 1962)
- Fustel de Coulanges, "The Ancient City: A Study of the Religion, Laws, and Institutions of Greece and Rome." Pantianos Classics, Kindle 2017, first published in 1877.
- Gellately, R. "Lenin, Stalin and Hitler: The Age of Social Catastrophe." Vintage Books, 2008.
- Gentile, G. "Origins and Doctrine of Fascism: with Selections from Other Works." Routledge, 2017.
- Geyer, M. & Fitzpatrick, S. "Beyond Totalitarianism: Stalinism and Nazism Compared." Cambridge University Press, Kindle 2009.
- Grand, A. "Italian Fascism: It's Origins and & Development." University of Nebraska Press, 2000.
- Hayek, F. "The Road to Serfdom." Routledge, original 1944.
- Hazlitt, H. "Economics in One Lesson: The Shortest & Surest Way to Understand Basic Economics." Three Rivers Press, 1979. (originally published 1946)
- Hett, B. "The Death of Democracy: Hitler's Rise to Power." William Heinemann, Kindle 2018.
- Hibbert, C. "Mussolini: The Rise and Fall of Il Duce." St Martin's Press Griffin, 2008.
- Hirschfeld, G. "The Policies of Genocide: Jews and Soviet Prisoners of War in Nazi Germany." Routledge, Kindle 2015 (original 1986).

- Hitler, A. "Mein Kampf." Jaico Books, 2017.
- Hitler, A. "Zweites Buch (Secret Book): Adolf Hitler's Sequel to Mein Kampf." Jaico Publishing House, 2017.
- Hobsbawm, E. "The Age of Extremes: 1914-1991." Abacus, 1995.
- Hoppe, H. "A Theory of Socialism and Capitalism." Kindle.
- Joseph Goebbels and Mjölnir, Die verfluchten Hakenkreuzler. Etwas zum Nachdenken (Munich: Verlag Frz. Eher, 1932). (English translation)
- Keen, S. "Use-Value, Exchange-Value, and the Demise of Marx's Labor Theory of Value." PDF.
- Kershaw, I. "Hitler: 1936-1945 Nemesis." Penguin Books, 2001.
- Kershaw, I. "Stalinism and Nazism: Dictatorships in Comparison." Cambridge University Press, Kindle 2003.
- Keynes, J. "National Self-Sufficiency," The Yale Review, Vol. 22, no. 4 (June 1933), pp. 755-769.
- Kobrak & Hansen. "European Business, Dictatorship, and Political Risk, 1920-1945." Berghahn Books, 2004.
- Luxemburg, R. "The Accumulation of Capital." Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, 1951. (Originally written in 1913.)
- Luxemburg, R. "The National Question" 1910.
- Marx, K. "Capital: A Critique of Political Economy: Volume I Book One: The Process of Production of Capital." PDF of 1887 English edition, 2015.
- Marx, K. "Capital: A Critique of Political Economy: Volume II Book One." Penguin Classics, Kindle edition. (Originally written 1894)
- Marx, K. "Capital: A Critique of Political Economy: Volume III." PDF, English edition, 2010. (Originally written 1894)
- Marx, K. "On the Jewish Question." Edited by Tucker, R. PDF. (Originally written 1843)
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. "Manifesto of the Communist Party." PDF 1969, original 1848.
- Mises, L. "Human Action: A Treatise on Economics." Martino Publishing, 2012. (Originally 1949)
- Mises, L. "Socialism: An Economic and Sociological Analysis." Liberty Fund, 1981. 1969 edition (roots back to 1932).
- Moorhouse, R. "The Devil's Alliance: Hitler's Pact with Stalin, 1939-1941." Random House Group, Ebook (Google Play) 2014.
- Mosley, O. "Fascism: 100 Questions Asked and Answered." Black House Publishing, Kindle 2019.
- Muravchik, J. "Heaven on Earth: The Rise and Fall of Socialism." Encounter Books, Kindle.
- Mussolini, B. "The Doctrine of Fascism." Kindle, Originally published in 1932.
- Newman, M. "Socialism: A Very Short Introduction." Kindle.
- Niemetz, K. "Socialism: The Failed Idea That Never Dies." The Institute of Economic Affairs, 2019.
- Nitti, F. "Bolshevism, Fascism and Democracy." PDF, 1927.
- Neumann, F. "Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism, 1933-1944." Oxford University Press, 2009. (Original 1942.)
- Orwell, G. "Nineteen Eighty-Four." Penguin Books, 2000 (originally 1949).
- Orwell, G. "Homage to Catalonia." Penguin Books, 2000 (originally 1938).

- Overy, R. "The Nazi Economic Recovery 1932-1938." Second Edition, Cambridge University Press, 1996 (original 1982).
- Reimann, G. "The Vampire Economy: Doing Business under Fascism." Kindle, Mises Institute, 2007. Originally written in 1939.
- Reisman, G. "Why Nazism was Socialism and why Socialism is Totalitarian." Kindle 2014.
- Siedentop, L. "Inventing the Individual: The Origins of Western Liberalism." Penguin Books, Kindle.
- Smith, A. "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations." Kindle.
- Smith, D. "Lenin's 'Imperialism': A Study in the Unity of Theory and Practice." The Journal of Politics 17, no. 4 (1955): 546-69. Accessed February 15, 2020.
www.jstor.org/stable/2126614.
- Sowell, T. "Economic Facts and Fallacies: Second Edition." Kindle.
- Sowell, T. "The Housing Boom and Bust." Kindle.
- Spengler, O. "Prussianism and Socialism." Isha Books, 2013. First Published 1920.
- Stalin, J. "Marxism and the National Question." Red Star Publications, 2015.
- Steinbacher, S. "Auschwitz: A History." Penguin Books, 2005.
- Snyder, T. "Blood Lands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin." Vintage, 2011.
- Temin, P. "Soviet and Nazi Economic Planning in the 1930s." From The Economic History Review, New Series, Vol. 44, No. 4 (Nov., 1991), pp. 573-593 (21 pages). Jstor.
- Tooke, A. "Wages of Destruction: The Making & Breaking of The Nazi Economy." Penguin Books, 2007.
- von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, E. "Leftism: From de Sade and Marx to Hitler and Marcuse." Arlington House Publishers, PDF 1974.
- Weller, P. "The New Liberalism: Liberal Social Theory in Great Britain 1889-1914." Routledge 2017.
- Young, A. "Nazism is Socialism." The Free Market 19, no. 9 (September 2001).
- Zitelmann, R. "Hitler: The Policies of Seduction." London House, 1999.
- "The Cambridge History of the Second World War. Volume III: Total War Economy, Society and Culture." Cambridge University Press, 2017.

The American Economic Review, Vol. 1, No. 2, Papers and Discussions of the Twenty-third Annual Meeting (Apr., 1911), pp. 347-354

Hitler's Confidential Memo on Autarky (August 1936)

<http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/English61.pdf>

Deficit Spending in the Nazi Recovery, 1933-1938: A Critical Reassessment

http://personal.lse.ac.uk/ritschl/pdf_files/ritschl_dec2000.pdf

Manish, G. "Labor and Capitalist Exploitation: Böhm-Bawerk and the Close of Marx's System"

<https://mises.org/wire/labor-and-capitalist-exploitation-bohm-bawerk-and-close-marxs-system>

Mises "Planned Chaos" (an excerpt from "Socialism: An Economic & Sociological Analysis")
<https://youtu.be/7EnHeZXLzTc>

TomWoodsTV - Ep. 1474 What Is Fascism? Published on 21 Aug 2019

<https://youtu.be/qOsVqXMFAdg>

Woods, The Forgotten Depression of 1920,
<https://mises.org/library/forgotten-depression-1920>

Woods, T. "The Anti-Marxist Argument That Clinches It." <https://youtu.be/ffq-8qr6avg>

Sargon of Akkad Live "Debate: Socialsm vs Capitalism," <https://youtu.be/z6gB3gA9UZg>

Sir Oswald Mosley | Interview | Thames Television | 1975
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HNhF28fzN9I>

Timcast, "Woke Professor SLAMS SpongeBob Squarepants As Racist Colonizer, THIS CANT BE REAL," <https://youtu.be/0CQSQkO0ZQU>

Cambridge Dictionary <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/public>
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/private-sector>

Online Latin-Dictionary
<http://www.latin-dictionary.net/definition/32212/publicus-publica-publicum>

Online Etymology Dictionary <https://www.etymonline.com/word/public>

Oxford Dictionary of English, Oxford University Press, Third Edition 2010.

Barker, University of Hawaii, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/734722>

Bernanke, "The Benefits of Price Stability," 2006, The Federal Reserve
<https://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/bernanke20060224a.htm>

ECB "The definition of price stability"
<https://www.ecb.europa.eu/mopo/strategy/pricestab/html/index.en.html>

<https://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Reichstagsbrandverordnung>

http://home.wlu.edu/~patchw/His_214/_handouts/Weimar%20constitution.htm

https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Weimar_constitution

http://www.zum.de/psm/weimar/weimar_vve.php

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/fromm/works/1961/man/ch06.htm>

https://wiki.mises.org/wiki/Inflation_in_Nazi_Germany

"A nation or territory considered as an organized political community under one government." <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/state>

https://enacademic.com/dic.nsf/enwiki/1648092/Tendency_of_the_rate_of_profit_to_fall

<https://fee.org/articles/were-still-haunted-by-the-labor-theory-of-value/>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Josef_Terboven

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/10/02/clapping-replaced-jazz-hands-student-union-a-mid-fears-noise/>

<https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/7475551/snowflake-students-get-litter-squad-banned/>

<https://www1.cbn.com/cbnnews/world/2019/july/uk-student-who-was-kicked-out-of-class-for-saying-there-are-2-genders-will-not-return-to-school-nnbsp>

<https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/gaslight>

TIK "Public vs Private | The Historic Origins of the words Socialism & Capitalism"
https://youtu.be/ksAqr4ILA_Y

TIK, "The REAL Reason why Hitler HAD to start WW2," <https://youtu.be/PQGMjDQ-TJ8>

TIK, "Why they don't tell you about Hitler's "Shrinking Markets" problem,"
<https://youtu.be/go2OFpO8fy0>

TIK, "How to Ideologically undermine Holocaust Denialism," <https://youtu.be/qtACBI1Txrc>

TIK, "Was Hitler a Strong or Weak Dictator? Intentionalist vs Functionalist/Structuralist Debate" <https://youtu.be/U8LNFjFyGU8>

TIK, "The Fate of Soviet Prisoners of War," <https://youtu.be/OeRR100incE>